

Filling Gap in EFL Teachers' Informal Formative Assessment: Insights from Higher Education Level

Milawati¹, Nunung Suryati², Dewi Wardah Mazidatur Rohmah³

¹Politeknik Negeri Madura, Indonesia. e-mail: milawati@poltera.ac.id

²Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. e-mail: nunung.suryati.fs@um.ac.id

³Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia. e-mail: dewi.rohmah@ecampus.ut.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
<p>Keywords: ESRU Model, EFL Teacher, higher education level, Informal formative assessment</p> <p>DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v7i1.1134</p> <p>How to cite: Milawati, M. , Suryati, N., & Rohmah, D. W. M. (2022). Filling Gap in EFL Teachers' Informal Formative Assessment: Insights from Higher Education Level. <i>Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics</i>, 7(1), 13-34</p>	<p><i>This study presents the informal formative assessment practice embedded in teacher-students interaction in daily teaching activities. Although many previous studies claimed as informal formative assessment, the adequate information on how informal formative assessment integrated in EFL classroom interaction in the higher education level was not acquired yet. A case study design on ESRU Model was used with 59 Indonesian EFL teachers in higher education level. Online Survey questionnaire was used to determine participants to be involved for further investigation in classroom observation and interview. This research highlighted clarifying learning goal as prerequisite activity before conducting the ESRU model activities. Interestingly, of the four activities in ESRU model, the use information gained was potentially support students' learning compared to other three activities; Elicits information, the student responds, and the teacher recognizes students' responses. Hence, this study can contribute insight for the teachers to reflect their own teaching practice.</i></p>

1. Introduction

As the international trends on assessment growing up, formative language assessment views as a dynamic, constructed assessment in classroom interaction, which involves both formal and informal processes (Hill, 2017; Daskin, 2017a; Daskin, 2017b; Wyner, 2017; Gotwals and Birmingham, 2016; Birenbaum et al., 2015; Hill & McNamara, 2011; Leung, 2007; Rea-Dickins, 2001). This re-conceptualized definition has highlighted informal formative assessment as a part of daily teaching practice in the classroom, carried out informally through dialogue, demonstration, and observation to elicit evidence of students' knowledge and understanding (Can Daskin and Hatipoglu, 2019). It can also be informal formative as occasional and

unplanned, e.g. teacher direct comments and feedback (Gotwals and Birmingham, 2016). Likewise, other previous studies have acknowledged the informal dimension of formative assessment as a continuum practice from the formal assessment (Leung, 2004; McNamara, 2001; Rea-Dickins, 2001; Ruiz-Primo, 2011; Turner & Purpura, 2016). Due to its practical used which embedded in the assessment, this informal formative assessment also identified as *assessment conversation* (Furtak, 2011). These previous studies have also discussed the extent of how the assessment is planned, graded, form, and source of the assessment (including teaching activities, interaction, etc.) to make the assessment being formative.

The shift of informal formative assessment recognizes that it is firmly embedded in daily teaching and learning activities. It enables the teacher to gather information about students' strengths and weaknesses during classroom interaction. The information collected is transient and remains unrecorded (Rui-Primo, 2011). A number of studies have acknowledged the importance of informal formative assessment. Most of them occur in a scientific context at a primary and secondary level (Furtak et al., 2016; Furtak, 2006; Gattulo, 2000). Meanwhile, the informal formative assessment practice within EFL context remains scarcely. The three studies from Lee (2011), Gattulo (2010), and Gotwals and Birmingham (2016) show the potential of Initiation, Response, Follow-up (IRF) classroom interaction in creating assessment events in informal formative assessment within a primary and secondary school. Other informal formative assessment studies in higher education context lead to minimalize the gap between the existing students' knowledge and the expected knowledge in different EFL contexts. For instance, Heritage and Heritage (2013) investigated the interactional practices that could reflect formative assessment in the Australian context. In this case, the use of teacher questioning in IRE/F sequence a source of the data. The findings revealed that respectful pedagogical questioning is a crucial resource in eliciting students' current learning status and making decisions about student learning's next steps. However, dealing with students' responses during the informal formative assessment practice has not been classified yet. Unlike Heritage and Heritage's (2013) studies, Jiang (2014) study has covered the classification of students' responses in informal formative assessment. However, Jiang does not clearly state the use of information gained by the students. As a result, adequate information about the informal formative assessment embedded in the daily teaching-learning process is not yet acquired.

In contrast to the earlier studies, C n Daskin (2017), with her conversation analysis (CA), illustrated how formative assessment informally emerges as interactional practice in an L2 classroom in the Turkey context. Her study notes that informal formative assessment occurred spontaneously in and through interaction even in the traditional L2 classroom, a teacher –fronted and grammar oriented. To get the insight information about bridging classroom interaction and informal formative assessment, a further investigation was done by C n Daskin (2019), which deploys a Reference to a Past Learning Event (RPLE) in an EFL classroom in a preparatory school at the tertiary level. The findings could bridge a gap between language assessment and classroom research by integrating classroom interaction competence and teachers' informal formative assessment ability. However, there is a missing step that is not included among the two previous studies done by C n Daskin. It clarifies the learning expectation (Ruiz-Primo, 2011) as a prerequisite for implementing informal formative assessment activities (Eliciting, interpreting, and using the information). In short,

there is still a growing practice of informal formative assessment among teachers in the world, yet they have the contextual barriers that they should be dealt with.

Due to the shortcoming in the previous studies mentioned above, we felt a further investigation of informal formative assessment is necessary. Besides, in Indonesian context, little research has been conducted on informal formative assessment. The current study still relies on formative assessment practice in a formal way (Widiati and Saukah, 2017). Consequently, some revisions are pointed out based on a particular dimension which uncovers in Jiang's study, and since this research comes up with the new findings. First, due to the shortcomings of Jiang (2014) and Heritage Heritage (2013) the IRF classroom interaction pattern perhaps does not give clear information related to informal formative assessment. However, some researchers considered that IRF might be appropriate to informal formative assessment context (Well, 1999; Lamke, 1990) as cited in Ruiz-Primo (2011). The ESRU model developed by Ruiz-Primo and Furtak (2007) in which the teacher *Elicits* information, the Student responds, the teacher *Recognizes*, and the teacher *Uses* the data collected to enhance students learning are chosen in our study. It is selected under consideration that the three issues mentioned by Ruiz-Primo, (2011) with respect to informal formative assessment could uncover what IRF pattern do not have. The issues are teacher is not the only one who initiate the conversation, but it could also student's comment; teacher, students also peers could use the information collected depending on the interaction pattern which emerges in classroom; informal formative assessment could have multiple iterations before the cycle is fully completed. Another gap is the teachers' ability to assess informally for a formative purpose need to be comprehensively illustrated. By integrating clarifying learning goals to the existing informal formative strategies, it is expected that the gap between the current students' level and the expected knowledge could find. As a result, the appropriate follow up action could take by the teacher. Thus, our study investigates how teachers' informal formative assessment strategy practice in EFL classroom interaction in higher education contexts.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Informal Formative Assessment

It is worth noting that the informal formative assessment as a continuum of formal formative assessment. It is used to make explicit evidence of what students know, do, and get about their learning goals. Both formal and informal have each own manner. Formative assessment, for instance, it is likely to be more systematic and planned. The forms are embedded in the curriculum. It could be in the form of short tests, quizzes, homework exercises, observation protocols, in-class assignments or activities, in-or-out class projects simulation or role-play activities, checklist, student conferences, and peer assessment (Lee, 2011; WIDA, 2009). The activity enables the teacher to evaluate their teaching, check students' understanding, and plan for the next steps to move forward their learning. The teacher has already planned formative assessment implementation from the beginning until the end of a unit.

Conversely, informal formative assessment is more spontaneous when it is immediate and unplanned. It could take place in any teacher-student interaction at the whole class, group, or peers level (Furtak, 2011; Sheris, 2011). As it is firmly embedded and strongly linked to daily teaching-learning activities (Furtak, 2011; Heritage & Heritage, 2013; C n Daskin, 2017, 2019),

the information gathered could be in the form of verbal (e.g., students comments, questions) or nonverbal like teacher' observation during a course. In terms of interpreting and acting is more immediate, spontaneous and flexibel due to its different forms.

Table 1. 1. Differences between formal and informal formative assessment practices (Ruiz-Primo & Furtak, 2007)

Formal: Designed to provide evidence about students' learning		
Gathering	Interpreting	Acting
The teacher collects or brings together information from students at a planned time. For example, quizzes, embedded assess	The teacher takes time to analyze information collected from students. For example: reading student work from all the students, providing written comments to all students.	The teacher plans an action to help students achieve learning goals.
Informal: Evidence of learning generated during daily activities		
Eliciting	Recognizing	Using
The teacher brings out or develop information in the form of verbal response from students. For example: asking students to formulate explanations or to provide evidence	Teacher reacts on the fly by recognizing students' response and comparing it to accepted scientific ideas For example: repeating, revoicing students' response	The teacher immediately makes use of the information from the students during the ongoing classroom narrative For example: asking students to elaborate on their response, explaining learning goals, promotes argumentation

2.2 ESRU Model

The theories of ESRU (*Elicits* information, the Student responds, the teacher *Recognizes* students' responses and *Use* the gained information) model by Ruiz Primo-Furtak (2007) is develop in order to scrutinize EFL teacher practice in informal formative assessment. First clarifying is to be crucial activity in informal formative assessment practice. This activities has been missed in the earlier studies in informal formative assessment (Sheris, 2011; Heritage& Heritage, 2013; Bailey & Heritage, 2014; Jiang, 2014; C n Daskin, 2017), only Ruiz-Primo (2011) stated that clarify the learning expectation as a prerequisite to collect other informal formative assessment information. Further, it enables the teacher to explain the learning goals and discuss the success criteria with their students. Second activity is eliciting which most researchers provide as the initial activity in informal formative assessment practice. However, the questions deployed were varied based on its purpose on different context (Sheris, 2011; Heritage& Heritage, 2013; Bailey & Heritage, 2014; Jiang, 2014). Eliciting enables the teacher to initiate students' response. The questions classified by Richard and Lockharts (1994) are chosen. Regarding to its potential benefit in EFL formative assessment context, eliciting could encourage student to think rather than to check students' understanding (Jiang, 2014). They are procedural, convergent and divergent. The procedural questions have to do with what is going on in the classroom. It is used to enhance students focus on the lesson, to facilitate their comprehension and to promote classroom interaction. Meanwhile, the convergent question is used to encourage student response to the question on the recall information. Last, divergent questions were used to answer the questions in the higher level thinking. In that way, students are encouraged to answer based on their knowledge, experience and information rather than based on the material presented.

The third step, student(s) response toward teacher eliciting questions. Unlike other previous study, Jiang (2015) classified the students' response into several categories no answer, individual response, no response, and choral. In line with this, Doug Lemov (2010) specifically classified student response into two classification; correct and incorrect response. Correct response in term of its form in short answer, word or phrase which match to one of teacher's acceptable answer. While incorrect students' response, as Whessel (2015) indicated by partially correct answer, correct answer at the wrong times an incorrect answer for correct principle.

The fourth step is recognizing which teacher could recognize on students' actual knowledge. In particular, it indicates to student that his/ her response has been heard and accepted in ongoing classroom discussion (Ruiz-Primo & Furtak, 2006). By recognizing students' response, teacher has opportunity to act on them and evaluate the correctness of teacher's interpretation of their contribution.

The last step is using, described when the teacher could use the information gathered to guide the students' gain their learning goals (Ruiz Primo-Furtak, 2006). It enables teacher elaborates students' response, redirect student's thinking, model communication, connect the new idea and familiar ones. Those activities could occur quickly, spontaneously, flexibly, in, and through daily classroom interaction (Cân Daskin & Hatipoglu, 2019; Heritage & Heritage, 2013; Ruiz-Primo, 2011).

3. Research Methodology

This study has employed qualitative case study approach as a research design (Creswell, 2014, p.465) which attempts to explore in detail of informal formative assessment in EFL classroom interaction. 59 EFL teachers at higher education level in Indonesia were participated through online survey questionnaire adopted from Gonzales & Apilongo (2012) about Classroom Assessment Practices Questionnaire for Language Teachers (CAPSQ-LT). It aims to measure their knowledge about classroom based assessment which covers assessment as learning, Assessment of learning (AoL), Assessment for learning (AfL) which refers to formative Assessment, Assessment for instruction (Afi) and assessing to inform. 43 participants met the criteria of formative assessment protocol by Gonzales and Apilongo (2012), and have positive attitude towards assessment, however, only Five EFL Teachers and their classes were chosen purposely based on the consent form filled by the participants.

Table 2.1 Participant Background

Participants	University	Year Experience	The average number of students	Students' Year
Teacher 1 (T1)	Private University	About 7 years (certified teacher)	16-25 students	3 rd A, 3 rd B
Teacher 2 (T2)	State University	About 6 years (certified teacher)	More than 25 students	2 nd A, 2 nd B
Teacher 3 (T3)	State University	About 5 years (uncertified teacher)	More than 25 students	2 nd C, 2 nd A
Teacher 4 (T4)	Islamic State University	About 3 years (uncertified teacher)	More than 25 students	2 nd B, 2 nd C, 2 nd D
Teacher 5 (T5)	Private University	About 2 years (uncertified teacher)	16-25 students	1 st A, 1 st B

Classroom observation was conducted to obtain information about teachers' informal formative assessment. Five EFL teachers major in English Department with their classes were chosen. T₁ and T₅ were observed for seven sessions. T₂ was observed for two sessions because there was classroom project for the next few meetings. T₃ was observed four sessions, and T₄ was observed for five sessions. Video-recordings were undertaken to capture verbal and non-verbal teachers' behavior in the class. To ensure anonymity, we coded T for Teacher, S for Student (such as S₁, S₂, S₃) and Ss for Students. Meanwhile, the data from the interview was used to confirm the observation data.

Conversation analysis (CA) is used to analyze the data collected under investigation, since it is mostly used by researcher to analyze the organization of social interaction (Heritage, and Heritage, 2013, Balaman and Can Daskin, 2019) and get the meaning of the interaction through coding scheme (Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Miles and Huberman, 2014). In particular, the data has been analyzed through some procedures consists of three current flows activity : data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. In particular, some steps have been conducted in analyzing the data which cover the following activities. (1) Aggregating the data gathered, involving all of the information from the field. In this case, the data obtained were processed by transcribing the teachers' and students' utterances gained by the result of videotape recording during the classroom interaction were conducted. (2) Classifying the data gained by the result of recording transcription. Those were classified in terms of the classroom interaction pattern in informal formative assessment context. There were classifying (C), eliciting (E), students' response (S), and recognizing students' response (R) and using the information gained (U). (3) Displaying the data which has been selected and simplified in the form of table presented. (4) Interpreting the data which analyzed descriptively; (5) Validating the data, the results of data analysis from transcription were crosschecked out with the data from the result of field notes to validate the findings; (6) Reporting the result, making the conclusion, which were derived in regard with the result of findings and discussions to answer research questions

4. Findings

After analyzing the data gathered from classroom observation, it was found that all participants applied numerous questions and response in each sequences of participants. The selections of the question uttered by teacher resulted in 82 questions used by T₁, 114 questions used by T₂, 180 questions used by T₃, 244 questions used by T₄ and 106 questions used by T₅. Regarding to the selection of response uttered by students(s) was resulted 91 responses used by T₁, 146 responses used by T₂, 170 responses used by T₃, 245 responses used by T₄ and 166 responses used by T₅. Totally, there were 726 questions and 818 responses analyzed by classifying, categorizing, and counting the frequency based on the stated research problems.

4.1 Clarifying the learning goal

Clarifying the learning goal had to do with teacher explanation about the learning goal as well as the succes 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 about the learning goal and connecting the discussion to the learning goal. Particularly, it was explicitly uttered by all participants, at the beginning of the

meeting and in the middle of the teaching learning process was being conducted as it is presented in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1 clarifying the learning goal strategy

Teacher	Questions per session		Clarifying the learning goal strategy			
			Reminding students about the purpose of an activity		Connecting the conversation to the learning goal	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
T1	4	100	-	-	4	100
T2	5	100	5	100	-	-
T3	4	100	-	-	4	100
T4	5	100	-	-	5	100
T5	10	100	10	100	-	-
Average	5	100	3	100	3	100

It was found that 5% all the participants (T1, T2, T3, T4, and T5) has clarified their learning goal to their students in their classes. Though, the strategy that the participants used, were varied. T1, T3 and T4 were used the same strategy to clarify their learning goal. That was connecting conversation strategy. The numbers of frequency which they obtained were different. T1 and T3 were found 4%; T4 was 5% clarified her learning goal by connecting conversation strategy. Differently to the three participants, T2 and T5 were shown different strategy used to clarify their learning goals, that was reminding students about the purpose of an activity. T2 was 5% and T5 was 10%. Based on the result of data analysis, it was revealed that all participants had clarified their learning goals during the whole meeting either on online and offline classroom observation.

"alright. So, today we will start the online discussion on ESP and our material today about approach of Instructional methodology in teaching ESP. so we'd like to have online discussion because you have done your assignment and not submitted your assignment." – T1

"yeah and today we are going to have inflectional, and the presenters are?"- T2

"So, what is the topic today then? After 'expectation'?" – T3

"So today I am going to explain first. Eventhough it is just speaking 1, I need you to have open thing about create debate before you practise it next week. Ok then, the material that I want to explain to you is about the terms and the technique of the debate that I'm sure this is the first time for you to know about this one."- T4

"Please see point B. Listening – understanding directions. Match each expression (a-g) with a picture (1-7) number A its already given for you." – T5

The excerpt revealed that the teachers stated their learning goals explicitly. Particularly, when they had finished teaching one material, and wanted to move to the new materials to be delivered to their students. In addition, the purpose of clarifying learning strategy of each teacher was the same. That was aimed to know what was really going on to clarify learning goals of each participant in their classes.

4.2 ESRU Model

ESRU Model proposed by Furtak (2011) was used as a protocol to describe EFL teachers' informal formative assessment practice under investigation. There were four sequences in ESRU model. They were teacher elicited questions (E), students' response toward teachers' questions (S), teacher recognized students' responses (R) and teacher used the information gathered (U) during EFL classroom interaction. Of the four sequences in ESRU model, only the last two sequences were discussed in detail under consideration that the two sequences were essential sequences in informal formative assessment practice which mostly ignored by the previous research findings on informal formative assessment. The existing research on informal formative assessment focuses on Initiation Response and Feedback (IRF) Sequence which only covered the eliciting, students' response and feedback as a part of teacher used the information gathered. Hence, it can be implied that ESRU model could cover what the IRF sequence did not have.

4.2.1 Teacher recognized students' responses

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. Table 4.2 presents the frequency of teacher recognized students' response.

Table 4.2. The Frequency of Teacher Recognizing Students' Responses

Teacher	Response per session		Recognize students' response							
			Repeating		Rephrasing		Displaying		Wait time	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
T ₁	27	96	22	81	3	11	-	-	1	4
T ₂	24	100	17	71	-	-	7	29	-	-
T ₃	27	89	19	70	1	4	1	4	3	11
T ₄	37	100	30	81	7	19	-	-	-	-
T ₅	45	93	36	80	2	4	1	2	3	7
Average	31	100	25	80	3	8	2	7	1	5

Table 4.4 indicated that teacher recognized students' response was 31 (100%) strategy per session. Of those recognizing students' response, 80% teacher mostly used repeating strategy rather than rephrasing (8%), displaying (7%) and wait time (5%). The following described teacher strategy in recognizing students' responses.

Repeating

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

T ₄	<i>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?</i>	EC.11
S ₁	<i>Clash of argument</i>	SI.35
T ₄	<i>Clash of argument...how do you explain it? Anyone can explain? or Luluk still wanna try to explain it?</i>	Rre.5 /ED.11
S ₅	<i>#Silent</i>	SN.3
T ₄	<i>So we clash our argument or opinion with other. Anything else about the requirements of debate?</i>	Rre.6 /UC.3
S ₁	<i>a number of reasons</i>	SI.37

The above excerpt described how T₄ employed repeating strategy. There were two occurrences of repeating strategy occurred in T₄'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 needed to encourage the student to clarify their superficial answer by asking divergent question. 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

Rephrasing

Rephrasing is one of teacher strategies to recognize students' responses which assist the student to understand a question or to solicit a more correct response. The teacher could reword the questions, provide additional information or break the questions into more manageable parts. It was used when the students did not understand the teacher's question.

S ₉	<i>About apa namanya, to be pretty, perfect, and flawless</i>	SI.118
T ₄	<i>About imperfection, nobodys perfect, talk about wasting time by measuring and comparing their beauty with others". "Any other opinions?" "Who wanna try?" "Semakin kalian menyampaikan, semakin banyak-banyak variasi dari background ya..." "As long as you raise the motion". "Ok, Oki, good</i>	RRP.3

T₄ rephrased her question by providing additional information to solicit more correct response. In particular, T₄ rephrased students' response 'to be pretty, perfect, and flawless' into 'imperfection'. The teacher then added more information related to imperfection "nobody's perfect, talk about wasting time by measuring and comparing their beauty with others". It seems that the teacher tried to strengthen students' response, and wanted to motivate other students' response.

Displaying

Displaying students' response was one of the teacher strategies to recognize students' answer. Normally, teacher display students' answer on whiteboard or orally to compare and analyze their response to others.

T2	<i>Berarti kamu mengharap dia mencintaimu?</i>	UD. 11
S9	<i>Iya"</i>	SI.27
T2	<i>Ok, tulis"</i>	RD. 2
S9	(He wrote down the right sentence on the whiteboard)	SI.28
T2	<i>Kalau situasi yang pertama, I am supposed to love her in my life. Berarti ada seseorang yang menginginkan dia berarti dia yang diharapkan untuk mencintai seseorang". "Maksudnya ("you")". (The teacher highlighted "I am" placed on the first sentence). Kalau di sini, she is supposed to love me (the second sentence or the right sentence) berarti, dia diharapkan untuk mencintai kamu". "Paham, ya?</i>	UP. 7
Ss	Ya	SC.9

The above excerpt revealed that T2 notice a particular student's answer. It is implied that students could know that his/her response had been heard by the teacher. Usually, it was occurred when there was unclear student's response, and then the teacher would display by writing down the answer on the whiteboard and asked other students' response about the answer.

Wait Time

Wait time as one of teacher strategy to recognize students' response. It was rarely used by the teacher during the classroom observation conducted. Ordinarily, wait time was given by the teacher when the teacher had just asked divergent question. The students needed some more time to think about the acquired answer. The following excerpt described the occurrence of wait time in T3's practice.

T3	<i>In your sentence, I am supposed to love her in my life. Who expects to love her?</i>	RRE. 4/EC.6
S9	<i>Her</i>	SI.18
T3	<i>#facial expression [wait time]</i>	
S9	<i>I</i>	SI.19
T3	<i>You expect something, kan ya?" "Is that correct, is the sentence correct, if you here, I, you expect something happen "Is it correct to say, I am supposed to love her?" "Who is expected to love someone?"</i>	UD. 4/ EC.7

The excerpt above described how T3 gave wait time to a particular student (S9). In the earlier, T3 had just repeated one particular response and asked convergent question related to the response. The student gave a short response. However, the student's answer was considered as incorrect. It was seemed from the frowning face showed by T3 after a while the student answered. Perhaps, the wait time used by T3 was expected that the student could realize about his answer was incorrect and he needed to change his answer correctly. The teacher then waited student to answer for a few second and the student had changed his answer. Unfortunately, the answer remained incorrect. As a result teacher modified her question in Indonesian in order student could understand about the material given.

4.2.2 Teacher used the 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.

Table 4.5 Using Information Gathered

Teacher	Strategy session		Using information gathered							
			Providing feedback		Comparing and Contrasting		Modeling		Debugging	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
T1	43	100	16	37	10	23	-	-	17	40
T2	83	100	26	31	3	4	12	14	42	51
T3	76	100	30	39	2	3	11	14	33	43
T4	149	100	83	56	34	23	10	7	22	15
T5	115	100	39	34	9	8	7	6	60	52
Average	93	100	39	40	12	12	8	8	35	40

Table 3.5 showed that there were 93 (100%) strategies per session found during classroom observation of all participants. Of the four strategies, providing feedback and debugging had the same proportion (40%), it was followed by comparing and contrasting (12%) and modeling (8%). The occurrence of each strategy in using the information gained was presented respectively.

Providing feedback

Providing feedback was aimed in order to promote students' thinking. Based on the results of classroom observation, it was found that 40 % the teacher provided information as their follow up action of the information gained. The example of providing feedback strategies was employed by T4's practice.

T4	<i>Okay, in what way you got difficulties in reading this one? How was it Diego?</i>	E	ED.3
S1	<i>Maybe...there many difficult words, so I got difficulty to understand the content.</i>	S	SI.2
T4	<i>To understand the content... but you got something a little bit...</i>	(R)U	UP.1
S1	<i>Yes, Ma'am.</i>	S	SI.3
T4	<i>Okay...How about the others? What's your difficulties? Okay, Salma...</i>	E	ED.4
S2	<i>.....sejarawan (the voice of the student was not clear)</i>	S	SI.4
T4	<i>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?</i>	U	UD.1
S4	<i>Because since elementary school I hate history so I don't understand this text.</i>	S	SI.11
T4	<i>Because you not really like with history, You don't really want to read this one.</i>	U	UP.3

S ₅	<i>Eventhough I don't like it, I.. I read it but I don't understand.</i>	S	SI.13
T ₄	<i>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?</i>	U	UP.4
S _s	<i>Yes..yes...</i>	S	SC.7

The above showed providing feedback strategy occurred in T₄'s practice. It was preceded by T₄'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. T₄ investigated the difficulties found by students. By eliciting question, T₄ 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 T₄ ended by giving more information and concluded the gap faced by the students. It was found some reasons which made the students could not understand the materials. There were unfamiliar words, uninteresting reading material, and uninteresting field of reading material. Though T₄ had already known about their reason, T₄ 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 T₄ had employed peer feedback in her classroom.

Comparing and contrasting

Comparing and contrasting was the most frequently used by the teacher as the follow up action of the previous information which was gained from the students. It was indicated when the teacher redirected question to other students or peers in order to clarify students' thinking. The example of comparing and contrasting strategies was employed by T₄'s practice.

T ₄	<i>But in some points there are actually are quite similar, but if you want to analyze deeper discussion and debate are different, let Mahrus explain what points that make them different?</i>	U/E	UP.15/E D.9
S ₆	<i>In debating there are no agreement, there is no it is like draw, like not the same. It means in debate there must be one winner. In disscussion there is no winner.</i>	S	SI.44
T ₄	<i>Okay..how about the other? give your argument? Do you agree with Mahrus? Come on, in debate, if you don't agree, you can share. You don't agree? good...come on...</i>	U	UC.7
S ₆	<i>In discussion, we just speak and listen.</i>	S	SI.45
T ₄	<i>to speak and listen..</i>	R	Rre.9
S ₆	<i>and to respect other opinion</i>	S	SI.46
T ₄	<i>Okay, in discussion we speak, listen and respect other's opinion. Very good, anyone else?</i>	U	UC.8

S7	<i>I agree with Mahrus that in discussion we discuss something to find the way of a problem, but when we are debating we talk about the thing that already decided and we use sources.</i>	S	SI.47
T4	<i>If you already talked about the difference, in what way these two things are similar?</i>	(R)E	ED.13
S7	<i>I think in discussion and debate we must talk to share our opinion and also debating and discussion also have the goal, they will get something to reach. It is different if we have debate competition, because it is about the judges who find the winner. But if we are discussing something and we are debating something, they are similar that is talking about something or issue.</i>	S	SI.46
T4	<i>Okay.very good Before we talk about the difference, as I mention before, debating and discussion are quite similar, do you agree? in what way are they similar?because both of them, debating and discussion are talking about something, that is issue or topic[...]because the goal of discussion is to find the solution of certain issue.</i>	U	UP.16

The above excerpt described how T₄ used the information gained to promote students' critical thinking. Firstly, the student initiated the question about the different of discussion and debate. As usual, both teachers did not answer the question directly. She let other student to answer. Meanwhile T₄'s practice showed the individual student respond to other student's respond. T₄ was asking other students whether they agreed or not to the previous student (S₆) answer. Once there was a student responded shortly to previous student's answer (S₆), the teacher elaborated the answer. In this case, teacher had elaborated the differences and the similarities of discussion and debate. Fortunately, S₇ already answered both similarities and differences of discussion and debate. Therefore, T₄ ended the discussion by providing feedback to strengthen and enrich students with new information about discussion and debate.

Modeling

Modeling was less frequently used by the teacher as the follow up action of information gathered. It was indicated when the teacher explained to the students about the thought of process through example. The example of modeling strategies was employed by T₂'s and T₃'s practice.

T ₃	<i>Do you understand possibility? Something that possibly happen to you, yes? ok, you (pointed to one of students)</i>	E	EC.39
S ₁	<i>I understand english newspaper</i>	S	SI.75
T ₃	<i>Ok, so understanding english newspaper, ok. first possibility is understanding english newspaper. yes, your possibility with your english skill?</i>	R/U	UP.16
S _s	<i>#Silent</i>	S	SN.2
T ₃	<i>What is the possibility, possibility?</i>	E	EC.40
S _s	<i>#Silent</i>	S	SN.3
T ₃	<i>Ngerti ndak sih maksud saya?</i>	E	EP.18
S _s	<i>Ngerti</i>	S	SC.38
T ₃	<i>Keinginan apa, kalian kan punya kemampuan bahasa inggris,ya..?</i>	E	EP.19

S ₅	<i>Iya</i>	S	SC.39
T ₃	<i>Keinginan kalian bisa ngapain aja sih?</i>	E	EP.20
S ₂	<i>Singing</i>	S	SI.76
S ₄	<i>Enrich my vocab</i>	S	SI.77
T ₃	<i>Enrich your english vocab?ok, for example, I can speak english, what is the possible thing that happen to me?</i>	R/U/ E	Rre.5/ UM.6/ ED.10
S ₅	<i>(Another female student) watching english movies without subtitles</i>	S	SI.78
T ₃	<i>Ok, understanding english movies without subtitles. ok, what else? After graduating from this university, for example....</i>	R/U	UD.30
S ₆	<i>Becoming a tour guide</i>	S	SI.79
T ₃	<i>Ok, becoming a tour guide, ok what else</i>	U/E	UD.31/ EC.41
S ₇	<i>Becoming a translator</i>	S	SI.80
T ₃	<i>Ok, becoming a translator</i>	R	UD. 32/EC. 42
S ₈	<i>A lecturer, teacher</i>	S	SI.81
T ₃	<i>Ok, so we have five possibilities that can happen to you by having your english speaking skill. So, you can understand english newspaper, watching english movies without subtitles, becoming a tour guide, becoming a translator and teaching english for example. Now, create a sentence using these modals to express these kinds of possibilities. in one minute. think quickly about the sentence. ok, regina number one!</i>	U	UP. 17

The excerpt above described modeling strategy employed by T₃. The sequence was started by T₃'s eliciting convergent question related to "possibility". The next sequence, a particular student responded correctly. T₃ then redirected the same question to another student. However, silent was responded by the chosen student. T₃ realized that student could not understand what had been asked by her. T₃ repeated her previous question, but the student remained silent. Immediately, T₃ modified her question into Indonesian, the student could easily catch up T₃'s question. As a result, there were several students had responded correctly. To promote students' understanding, T₃ then, repeated her first question about possibility in English and provided a case as the example. Fortunately, students could persistently answer correctly. Lastly, T₃ provided information as her direct feedback, and provided another exercises to strengthen their understanding.

Debugging

Debugging was teacher strategy to prompt students which had incorrect answer by hint or questioning to identify and correct themselves. The example of debugging strategies was employed by T₄'s and T₅'s practice.

T ₄	<i>So we clash our argument or opinion with other. Anything else about the requirements of debate?</i>	R/U	Rre.6 /UC. 3
S ₁	<i>a number of reasons?</i>	S	SI.37

<i>T₄</i>	<i>What do you mean by a number of reasons?</i>	<i>U/E</i>	<i>UD.4/ ED.12</i>
<i>S₁</i>	<i>the first is to convince other people that our opinion is right.</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>SI.38</i>
<i>T₄</i>	<i>to convince other people. Is it the function of debate or definition about debate?</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>UD.5 /EC.12</i>
<i>S₁</i>	<i>The function.</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>SI.39</i>
<i>T₄</i>	<i>Okay, so we can conclude that it is the function of debate.</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>UP.9</i>

The excerpt above described T₄ practiced debugging strategy in her classroom discussion. T₄ has just compared other students' answer about debate. Debugging was found when there was a student answer which seemed superficial. T₄ then, probe by asking 'What do you mean by a number of reasons?' After a while student responded in more complete answer. The teacher finally hinted her question by asking "Is it the function of debate or definition about debate?". Fortunately, the student could acquire his own answer.

5. Discussion

Of the four sequences in ESRU model, only the last two sequences were discussed in detail under consideration that the two sequences were essential sequences in informal formative assessment practice which mostly ignored by the previous research findings on informal formative assessment. Further the results of this study could investigate the phenomena of how ESRU Model practiced in EFL classes. They are teacher recognizes students' response and teacher used the information gained.

5.1 Recognize students' responses

Unlike other previous study in formative assessment like Parsons (2017), Widiastuti and Saukah (2017) and Jiang (2014) somehow neglected teacher strategy in making sense of students' responses; this recent study found that teacher recognized students' responses. It could benefit the teacher to have opportunity to act on them and evaluate the correctness of teacher's interpretation of their contribution.

Repeating, for instance, was used by all participants to recognize students' response. It is indicated when teacher fails to elicit his/her question. As a result, teacher should modify his/her question when the students find difficulties to understand teacher's question by repeating. As Kumaravadivelu (2006) notes that teacher should recognize when the students cannot answer his/her questions, the teacher should repeat the questions. If they still cannot answer even after the teacher repeats the question, the teacher could modify their question into more manageable parts in order they could make sense of what has been questioned by the teacher. This is supporting the findings of this research, actually on how teacher interpreting students' response. Particularly, when the students were silent, teacher repeated the question, but still no answer response from students. The teacher finally modified the question into native language. By modifying teacher's questions, teacher has provided the students' support to facilitate their language comprehension.

On the other hand the use of rephrasing was in line with what has been proposed by Goodwin (1983) they were rewording the questions, providing additional information or breaking the questions into more manageable parts. Mainly those are used when the students do not understand what is being asked by the teacher. Then, the teacher may wish either to assist

the students in understanding a question or to solicit a more correct response. In particular, the rephrasing strategy in which the teacher uses by breaking down the questions into more manageable part can be inferred that before the teacher breaks her questions, the teacher has already provided additional information firstly. It is hoped that the students will easily get an appropriate answer. However, the facts shown that the students still keep silent. It seems that they face difficulties in acquiring the answer, although the teacher has already added some more information to lead them. This probably happens because the question itself, perhaps considered as the higher level question. If it is a higher level question, certainly, they need more time to think about the appropriate answer. In fact, the teacher only gives a few second as their wait-time, absolutely it is a short time for them to think about the answer. This fact corresponds to what Walsh, et al (2017), Wragg and Brown (2001: 28) mention on the extent of teacher's fail in asking questions. In this case, it could be said that the teacher did not apply the teacher's questioning strategies as effectively. At last, the teacher initiates to solicit a more correct response by breaking down her question into some more manageable parts. Hence the teacher has already provided opportunities for meaningful interaction by making language comprehensible to the students. Unless, the language use by the teacher is comprehensible, the teaching learning process will not work well (Sherris, 2011).

Other strategy used by the teacher to recognize students' response is displaying. Teachers display students' answer on whiteboard or orally to compare and analyze their response to others. In that way, students could know that his/her response had been heard by the teacher. Usually, it was occurred when there was unclear student's response, and then the teacher would display by writing down the answer on the whiteboard and asked other students' response about the answer. What has been done by the teacher in displaying students' answer could benefit both the teacher and the students. The teacher could value the students' responses and the students could learn from each other in class. Hence, it could be inferred that displaying students' response could allow students to compare and analyze their responses. This reflected that the students could take role as interpreters while the teacher could facilitate students' interpretation (Ruiz-Primo, 2011).

Last strategy which employed by the teachers were wait time. It is teacher strategy to facilitate students time to think deeply between the asking and answering the questions. It was indicated when an individual student could not answer teacher's questions. Then, the teacher asked the students to think by providing wait time. While waiting for the answer, the teacher could add more information to encourage students to think about the acquired answer. According to Orlich (1998) teachers consider wait time to create chance for students to engage in meaningful interaction. In this study, it was found that while giving students' wait time, teacher showed her slide power point and explained some more information. At last, the teacher returned to her previous question to focus again on what being discussed. Particularly, on average, teacher waited less than a second before calling on a student to respond and only a further second for the student to answer. These findings slightly the same to Prasantianto (2019) and Rachmawaty (2019) which showed the lack of time in giving wait time to students. In line with this, some studies suggest to increase the wait time to three to five seconds or longer before rephrasing or asking another question (Wang, et.al, 2016; Walsh and Hodger, 2017a). Other studies also notes for five up to ten second for students to answer the teacher's question (Martinho, 2014).

In relation to the purpose of the wait time, basically, a higher-level question requires much wait-time. It is mostly used after the teacher elicited divergent question. However, in this study also found that the wait time is used when the teacher elicited convergent questions. It was in contrast with what has been stated by Wragg and Brown (2001) that the speed of delivery question is determined partly by the kind of question being asked. The more complex or difficult question the longer wait time is needed and vice versa. In other word, it can be said that the longer wait time spent is not influenced by the difficulty of the question, but it depends to whom the question is addressed to.

Although, some studies verify that increasing wait time leads to longer and higher quality students' response and participation from a greater number of students, moreover in the less able students', these effects are most notable (Goodwin, 1992). However, because of the limitation of this study, the correlation between the wait-time and the student's answers is not dealt with. By allowing wait-time, it is hoped that it could benefit the students to get easier to answer high level question from their teachers. Further, the students could have more chances to think deeply in acquiring the required answer.

5.2. Using information gathered

Differently to the formal formative assessment, this finding was used immediate action which happened during classroom interaction. In line with this, since there was an instructional dialogue occurred between teacher and students or among students in classroom, there would be informal formative assessment existed in classroom interaction (Cân Daskin and Hatipoglu, 2019; Cân Daskin, 2017a; Cân Daskin; 2017b). Indeed, it can be described as such immediate follow up action which happened spontaneously and unplanned. The event is usually unpredictable because it is impossible to know the advanced interaction entailed. Thus interaction can be part of any assessment event, whether planned or not. While it is unpredictable and naturally happens in the interaction, that makes informal formative assessment a rather more spontaneous incident (Cân Daskin and Hatipoglu, 2019).

In particular, to clarify the activities in using the information gathered, the use of ESRU sequence is used to manage the detail activities happened during the classroom interaction conducted. The sequences are clarifying the learning goal (Ruiz-Primo, 2011), eliciting students' response through teacher's questioning, interpreting students' response (Jiang, 2014), reacting toward students' response and using the information gathered (Ruiz-Primo & Furtak, 2006). The four former sequences have already been discussed in the previous section. Whereas, they are all integrated each other to clarify the detail activities happened during the information gathered sequence. Specifically, there are four activities cover in using information gathered sequence. They involve providing feedback, comparing and contrasting student(s) ideas, modelling and debugging. Those are presented respectively below.

Providing feedback

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. Particularly there were two kinds of feedback which provided by the teacher during the classroom interaction. They were peer feedback and teacher's direct feedback.

In relation to peer feedback, this study is similar to the findings revealed in previous research. For example, Jiang's (2014) findings noted that teacher in the content class cared more about how students could arrive at the acquired answer. Those actually could be found in all participants' practice (T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅). The teacher very often used peer feedback during their teaching. Perhaps, it happened because of the teaching learning process in higher education mostly employed a group discussion. Actually, it happened when there was a particular student asked question addressed to the group presented, but the group presented cannot answer the question or perhaps the group's response is not fully convinced certain student asked. Recognizing this situation, the teacher then asked other students' to response. In other word, the teacher recognizes what gap faced by a particular student. To solve the gap, the teacher employs peer feedback to scaffold the group presented to acquire the correct answer. It could be inferred that the feedback used by the peer has already answered three components to be the effective feedback by knowing student's actual knowledge, the goal that should be acquired and the strategy to achieve the goal (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Meanwhile a particular student could learn a new level of understanding from the interaction happened in the classroom when the feedback transpires from other students (Ruiz-Primo, 2011).

Another finding also revealed that the teacher employs direct feedback. Teacher directly comments and answers when the teacher notices an incorrect answer produced by particular student or the whole student during classroom interaction. This perhaps happened because of the teacher automatically reflect to student's mistake, especially in pronouncing certain word or phrase (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Other possibilities it may happen because the material itself considered as new information for students. It pushes the teacher to directly correct or comment toward student(s) response (Parsons, 2017). In short, both feedback employ in this study could give positive impact to the students either cognitive or affective (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Cognitively, for instance, the students could improve their understanding as the effect of the feedback. In addition, the feedback given could increase students' confidence to contribute in a classroom discussion.

In relation to formative assessment, the teachers' stages in employing peer feedback have reflected the stage where formative assessment could implement into teaching learning process. There are three key processes potentially used to conduct effective formative assessment namely; (1) establishing where the learners are in their learning, both teacher and student negotiate their language learning target, 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. Those stages in the findings are slightly the same to what have been noted by some previous formative assessment study (Gotwals & Birmingham, 2016; Ketabi & Ketabi, 2014; Clark, 2012; Gattulo, 2010; WIDA, 2009).

Comparing and contrasting

Comparing and contrasting was the most frequently used by the teacher as the follow up action of the previous information which was gained from the students. It was indicated when the teacher redirected question to other students or peers in order to clarify students'

thinking. Teacher asks another student to comment on the statement or get more information on the topic from another student. It is used to allow a student to correct another student's incorrect statement or respond to another student's question. Commonly, it occurs when there is a student gets stuck on an initial question, the teacher will ask another student or the whole class to give a response on that question. This situation is also in line with what has noted by Goodwin *et al* (1992).

Particularly the teachers frequently compare and contrast students' response by redirecting his/her questions either only to a particular student or to the whole class. The teacher may redirect his/her question from one student to another student, to get more information. Meanwhile the teacher may also redirect questions to the whole students in order that other students can clarify another student's answer. It can be inferred that the teacher redirect a question under different purposes.

In this case, redirecting which occurs in this study seems that the teachers expect another student to give additional information. It is supported that the first student's answer is not fully completed. The student only mentions a single answer. In fact, there is missing information which has not been answered yet. As a result, the teacher needs to redirect her question to the whole class in order to get more information in acquiring a complete answer. Meanwhile, in other context revealed that the teacher redirects her question in order to correct an initial student's answer. Once, one of the students tried to answer, but unfortunately, the answer was incorrect. This situation made the teacher to evaluate the answer by saying "no" automatically. Despite the incorrect answer, here, the teachers do not directly correct it by his/her self but the teacher let another student to correct the answer by saying "but". In other words, the word "but" can be implied that the teacher wants to redirect her questions to the whole class in order another student can correct the previous answer. This finding reflects that the teachers promote more student-centered pedagogy and encourage peer collaboration (Carless, 2011). In addition, the teachers' strategy in comparing and contrasting make students more responsive to the idea of cooperating with different students in their classroom interaction (Clark, 2012). Perhaps, the teacher could also foster students' autonomous learning by responding to other's comment or answer (William, 2011). In that way students could acquire new understanding through their peers.

Modelling

Modeling is teacher's strategy used to describe about certain concept to scaffold students' learning and promote students' critical thinking. It was indicated when the teacher explained to the students about the thought of process through example. However, this strategy is considered as less frequently used by the teacher to follow up the information gathered. Perhaps, it needs skillful strategies to practice modeling as it is mentioned by Hattie & Timperley (2007) to practice modeling teacher should consider about the goal of modeling, the relevant example which could meet the students' needs.

In particular, modeling occurs when there is a gap found after teachers' explanation. Usually, the teacher clarifies the gap found by repeating the students' response. However, when the students still keep silent, it is a need for teacher to explain again the material given by adding some more examples to support teacher's explanation. Meanwhile, the teacher considers about the purpose of taking modeling as his/her follow up action. Accordingly the teachers employ modeling to scaffold students to become easily understood about the material given.

They have modeled by using relevant example which is familiar to the students. As a result, it may encourage students to do the same thing as the teachers do (Furtak, 2016). Hence, it could be said that modeling gives positive impact in improving students' learning.

In other words, modeling activities and the example given by the teacher during classroom interaction, has met what has been considered by Roehler and Cantlon as cited in Ruiz and Primo (2011) in practicing modeling as follow up action of the formative assessment activities.

Debugging

Debugging was teacher strategy to prompt students which had incorrect answer by hint or questioning to identify and correct themselves (Ruiz-Primo, 2011). It usually occurs when the teacher initiates a high level question, but the students cannot respond correctly, or perhaps no answer response.

Teacher's hints and clues are used as a basis to identify prompting questions when classroom discussion is conducted. Debugging is not always done after an unsuccessful response, teacher can also prompt when she/he think it is needed to do (Ruiz-Primo, 2011). Usually the teacher gives an alternative answer or adds some media like showing power point presentation to support the students to think about the acquired response (Goodwin, 1992). It can be said that debugging is one of questioning technique that can help students gain confidence in giving replies, develop the skills necessary to think at higher cognitive levels and increase their participation in a classroom as well (Sherris, 2011).

However in other situation, it seems the teacher fail to debug their students. It usually happened when the teacher deployed divergent question which the answer is unknown for students. This finding is in line with what Ruiz-Primo (2011) noted when debugging does not scaffold students to acquire the appropriate answer, the teacher usually employs modeling to scaffold students' learning.

From the overall activities carried out by the teacher during classroom interaction, it can be inferred that they are in line with the principle of carried out activities in formative assessment practice. There are five sequences strategies include (1) clarifying and sharing learning intentions and criteria for success, (2) engineering effective classroom discussion and other learning tasks that elicit evidence of student understanding, (3) providing feedback that moves learners forward, (4) activating students as instructional resources for one another, and (5) activating students as the owners of their own learning (Black and William, 2009). In addition, the assessment event occurs in this study considered more informal rather than formal because this study employs classroom interaction as the form and source of the assessment, planning cannot be observable in the interaction analysis (as cited by Torrance & Pryor, 1998 in C n Daskin and Hatipoglu, 2019).

6. Conclusion

The informal formative assessment is aimed to identify their strength and weaknesses of their teaching performance. As a result, teachers could use the information to improve their performance. However, to carry out the informal formative assessments practice, teacher needs to clarify the learning goal in order that they can diagnose where the students are, where the students are going to, and how the students could achieve their goals. Teachers with skillful questioning strategies were becoming essential in determining the gap faced by

the students. However, not all teacher questions are considered to be formative, even when teacher questions are aimed at diagnosing learning. 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. Finally the informal formative sequence exists in this study could contribute the existing theory of informal formative assessment characteristics and stages.

References

- Almeida, PA. (2010). Classroom questioning: Teachers' perceptions and practices; presented WCES-2010. *Procedia social and behavioral sciences* 2 pp. 305-309. DOI:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.2015
- Antón, M. (2015). Shifting trends in the assessment of classroom interaction. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction* (pp. 74–89). Wiley Blackwell.
- Balaman, U. (2019). Sequential organization of hinting in online task-oriented L2 interaction. *Text & Talk, Vol 39(4)* 511-534.
- 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
- Can Daşkın, N. (2017a). A conversation analytic investigation into L2 classroom interaction and informal formative assessment. *ELT Research Journal, 6(1)*, 4–24.
- Can Daşkın, N. (2017b). A conversation analytic study of reference to a past learning event in L2 classroom interaction: Implications for informal formative assessment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Middle East Technical University.
- Cân Daskin, N, and Hatipoglu, C. (2019). Reference to a past learning event as a practice of informal formative assessment in L2 interaction. *Language Testing, 00(0)* Pp 16-30 DOI:10.177/0265532219857066
- Clayman, S. & Heritage, J. (2002). Questioning presidents: Journalistic deference and adversarialness in the press conferences of eisenhower and reagan. *Journal of Communication, 52(4)*, 749–775.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Course, S. (2014). ELT students' use of teacher questions in peer teaching. Presented at 14th International Language, literature, and Stylistics Symposium. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences* 158 pp. 331-336 DOI:10.1016/j.sbspro.201.12.096
- Furtak, E.M., Swanson, R, Kierner, 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
- Gonzales, R. DLC & Aliponga, J. (2012). ClassroomAssessmentPreferencesofJapaneseLanguageTeachers in thePhilippinesandEnglishLanguageTeachers in Japan. *MEXTESOL Journal, 36 (1)*, 1-12.
- Goodwin, S. S., Sharp, G. W., Cloutier, E. F., and Diamond, N. A. (1983). Effective Classroom Questioning. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED 285497)
- Harris, L. (2007). Employing a formative assessment in the classroom. *Improving Schools @Sage Publications, 10(3)* 249-260. DOI:10.1177/1365480207082558

- Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in Action: Action Formation and Territories of Knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1), 1–29.
- Heritage, M., and Heritage, J. (2013). Teacher questioning: The epicenter of instruction and assessment. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 26(3), 176–190.
- Isler, N. K., and C n Daskin, N. (2020). Reference to a shared past event in primary school setting. *Linguistics and Education*, 57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2020.100815>
- Jiang, Y. (2014). Exploring teacher questioning as a formative assessment strategy. *RELC Journal*, 45(3), 287–304. sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav. DOI: 10.1177/0033688214546962
- Martinho, M, Almeida, P.A, and Dias, J.T. (2014). Fostering students questioning through moodle: Does it work? Presented in 5th World Conference on Educational Sciences- WCES 2013. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences* 116. 2537-2542. DOI:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.607
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis, A Methods Sourcebook, Edition 3*. USA: Sage Publications.
- Mortimer, E. F., and Scott, P. H. (2003). *Meaning Making in Secondary Science Classrooms*. Buckingham. Open University Press.
- Rasyidah, U., Triana, N., and Saukah, A. (2020). The teachers' assessment knowledge and practice: Contribution of the past-time experiences to the present-time decision. *The Qualitative Report*, 25 (7). 1738-1753. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol25/iss7/1/>
- Prasetyanto, M. (2019). Kinds of questions making efl students learn: Students' perception. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature*, 4(2), 162-176 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.33369/joall.v4i2.7607>
- Rachmawaty, N and Ariani, S. (2019). 'Investigating The Types Of Teacher Questions In EFL Secondary Classroom'. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 276, 40-49. 6th International Conference on English Language and Teaching (ICOELT 2018). Retrieved from <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>
- Richards J.C and Lockhart C. (1994). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruiz-Primo, M. A., and Furtak, E. M. (2006). Informal formative assessment and scientific inquiry: Exploring teachers' practices and student learning. *Educational Assessment*, 11(3), 205–235.
- 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.
- Sherris, A. (2011). Teddy the T-Rex, interaction, and spontaneous formative second language assessment and treatment. *Classroom Discourse*, 2(1), 58–70.
- Widiastuti, I. A. M. S. & Saukah A. (2017). Formative assessment in EFL classroom practices. *Bahasa dan Seni*, 45(1). 50-63.
- Wragg, E. C. & Brown, G. (2001). *Questioning in the Secondary School*. New York: Routledge