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**Abstract**

The aims of this study were to identify the target needs, describe the learning needs and design the appropriate English material based on Integrated Performance Assessment for the eighth grade students of Junior High School. This study was classified as research and development (R&D). The study procedure was adapted from ADDIE models proposed by Branch (2009). It consists of analyze, design, develop, implement and evaluate. The data were collected through need analysis questionnaire, expert judgment rating scale, interview, and questionnaire for students about the materials. The data of questionnaires was analyzed quantitatively using frequency and percentage. Meanwhile, the data from the interview were analyzed using descriptive. The materials in the developed materials were developed based on Curriculum 2013. The result of expert questionnaire was 3.81. It was in the range of X ≥ 3.53 so it was categorized as very good. The mean result of the materials evaluation questionnaire was also 3.81 which categorized as very good. It can be concluded that the developed materials was considered appropriate.
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1. **Introduction**

According to the curriculum 2013, English learning process is directed to develop four skills, including listening, speaking, reading and writing. Those four skills are divided into two types; they are productive skills and receptive skills. Speaking and writing belong to productive skills because the learners required producing something. Receptive skills are the term used for reading and listening, the learners required to absorb information from the product of the productive skills.

The implementation of Curriculum 2013 became a problem in Magelang. Most of schools chose to keep using KTSP although that is not the newest one. The schools kept using the KTSP because they were not ready to use the newest one. According to the interview with one of teachers in Magelang district, it was found that there are only six from 126 of Junior High Schools in Magelang district which used Curriculum 2013. One of them is SMP N 1 Muntilan. The school that the researcher observed.

Based on the observation and discussion with the teacher of SMP N 1 Muntilan that there were some problems that happened in the eighth grade students. The teacher said that the first problem was the lack of the English materials. The teacher also said that they have to add materials by searching in the internet. The materials that were added by the teachers sometimes could not meet the students need because the teacher did not arrange it based on syllabus. The second problem was about the passiveness of the students in the teaching learning process. Although the book that is used consist of some activities that challenge students to active in class, still they did not engage on it. They found that the activities in class was boring. They needed more engaging activity to make them involved in the learning activities. As the goal of the Curriculum 2013 that the teaching-learning process is the learner-centred.

In reference to the problems that were found in SMP N 1 Muntilan above, it could be said that the textbook is not enough for the students. They need more sources to supplement the materials. The students need something new to enhance the students’ interest in the classroom. In order to maintain students’ motivation, it is needed to develop attractive materials and engaging activities. Attractive materials can be developed based on the theme which near to the students’ daily activity. The newest activities hoped can lead the students to become active, creative and critical in the teaching-learning process. Learner-centred teaching that focused on students learning rather than what teachers’ doing is good to be implemented because it can increase students’ engagement with the content and increase students’ learning and long- term retention. One way to succeed the learner-centred learning process is by giving students engaging activities. Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA) is an assessment prototype for measuring students’ progress in meeting specific aspects of the *National Standards for Foreign* *Language Learning in the 21st Century*. According to Adair- Hauck, Glisan, and Troyan (2013), the IPA is a performance-based assessment that consists of an interpretive, interpersonal, and presentational communication task aligned within a single theme in which a rater assesses students’ proficiency in each mode of communication. By adapting IPA in arranging tasks for students, it can be one of ways to build learner-centered teaching. Because IPA focuses to assess students’ performance rather than answer multiple choice test or alike. It also cares to assess students’ development rather than ranking them. It encourages students to think creative and critically because the activities are designed to create and present something.

1. **Literature Review**
2. **The Nature of Integrated Performance Assessment**

The Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA) was designed in 1997 as a result of a U.S.Department of Education International Research and Studies grant received by ACTFL (American Council of Teaching Foreign Languages). According to Adair- Hauck, Glisan and Troyan (2013), the IPA was designed to address the national need for assessing learner progress in meeting the content areas of the National Standards, in demonstrating performance depicted in the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. Taking into account the interconnected nature of communication, the IPA enables learners to demonstrate their ability to communicate within specific goal areas of the National Standards across the interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational modes of communication.

The IPA is standards-based, incorporating the three modes of communication, and it should include at least one other goal area (e.g., Culture or Connections). In keeping with the standards, the IPAs use authentic documents-texts created by native speakers for native speakers for the interpretive phase of the IPA. By using authentic documents, the Culture goal area is naturally incorporated into the IPAs.

Adair- Hauck, Glisan, and Troyan (2013) developed a prototype of the assessment, conducted widespread field tests in six research sites, and have subsequently published the findings for the profession. In their work, Adair- Hauck, Glisan, and Troyan (2013) set out to (1) design an assessment to measure students’ progress in meeting the SFLL, (2) research the effectiveness of the IPA as a standards-based assessment instrument, (3) assess the feasibility of implementing the IPA in the classrooms, the last (4) recognize to what range the IPA encourage teachers to change their practice. The locations of the field trial are in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, and Oregon. The teachers received training on the Oral Proficiency Interview or the Modified Oral Proficiency Interview. The IPA was piloted by some forty language teachers and approximately 1000 students of Chinese, French, German, Italian, Latin, and Spanish across grade level3-12. After each of three rounds of field testing the IPA for Purposes of researching its effectiveness as an assessment, the revision was made to the assessment and rubrics, performance data were compiled, and both teachers and students responded to questionnaire to share their perceptions of the IPA. The result of the initial IPA project illustrated that the IPA had a *washback effect* on instruction that is, it prompted teachers to modify their classroom practices to enhance their students’ performance.

From the consideration above, it can be concluded that the use of IPA in some countries can affect the positive washback so that teachers will struggle to create a new strategy and classroom management to enhance students’ performance.

1. **Three modes of IPA**

According to Adair- Hauck, Glisan, and Troyan (2013: 42), there are three modes of communication of Integrated Performance Assessment tasks as the following.

The *interpretive mode* involves activities that gives learners opportunities to listen to, read, or view authentic materials. Here, learners demonstrate understanding of these materials on two levels:  literal and interpretive.  At the literal level, learners demonstrate that they can understand the surface meaning of the text.  At the interpretive level, learners “read between the lines” to demonstrate that they can use their background knowledge and cultural understandings to provide a more complete interpretation of the message.

The *presentational mode* are generally ask students to prepare formal speaking or writing activities involving one-way communication to an audience or listeners and readers, such as giving a speech or report, preparing a paper or story, or producing newcast or video.  The roles of making the presentation is important and includes many drafts of written text and/or many practices of an oral presentation with reaction in order to present a final, polished product.

The *interpersonal modes* are two ways, interactive activities such as face to face or telephone conversations and writing activities such as writing email or text messages. The interpersonal mode has two important characteristics that influence the way the performance task is set up:  unrehearsed and negotiated. The first is *unrehearsed* means that the students have to “think on their feet” as they engage in a conversation or discussion. They cannot read from notecards or memorize their conversation or discussion. This activities can be said as spontaneous activities. The second is *negotiated activities. It* means that the students have to listen to the other participants’ comments and respond accordingly.

The three modes of communication above will be used in the developed materials to arrange the activities. By using the three modes above, it is hoped that the activities will be challenging for students. Therefore the students will be active and happy in teaching and learning process so that the learner center as Curriculum 2013 hopes will be reached.

1. **Method**

This study was classified as educational Research and Development (R&D). According to Branch (2009: 2), R & D is identified as the systematic process of translating principles of teaching and learning into plans for learning resources and instructional strategies. There are some steps of ADDIE models, namely: analyze, design, develop, implement, and evaluate. However, the researcher modified some steps in this study.

The product of the study was the culture-based material with Integrated Performance Assessment for the eighth grade students of Junior High School. The researcher did not only focus to the product but also observed the process before and after the materials implemented.

The study was conducted in SMP N 1 Muntilan. To get the data about the quality of the product, the researcher implemented the materials in the class. The subject of the research was a class consisted of 23 students. The researcher was given 4 meetings to implement the materials. Because the limitation of the time, the researcher could not implement all the units of the developed materials.

1. **Result**

There were several steps conducted in designing culture-based materials with Integrated Performance Assessment for the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Muntilan. The steps were presented as the result of the development in order to answer the questions in the research question. There were five steps presented in the result of the development. Those were the needs analysis, the course grid, the activities format, the evaluation and the revision of the first draft of culture-based materials with IPA for grade eight students of Junior High School and the implementation, evaluation and revision of the final draft of culture-based materials with IPA for grade eight students of Junior High School.

Information collection is the first step in conducting the Research and Development. Information collection is very important in conducting this study because it provides useful information which is used to know the students’ needs and interests. The needs analysis was conducted at SMP N 1 Muntilan.

The needs analysis was done in grade eight students of SMP N 1 Muntilan to obtain the students’ learning needs, interests and their background knowledge. Moreover, it is used to obtain the teacher’s method and opinion about the teaching and learning process. Besides, the researcher also analyzed the English curriculum 2013 of the eighth grade. The instrument of need analysis was a close-ended questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of several questions related to the students’ profile; the students’ opinion and interest of learning activities in the classroom; students’ preferred in the election of input, topic, materials; and the involvement of culture and IPA in the English materials. Those components were elaborated into 28 questions with mostly four options of answer. There were some questions in which students were only allowed to choose one option, and there were some questions in which the students were allowed to choose more than one options. The highest percentage was considered as the students’ need.

After the researcher developed the first draft of the materials, the next step was evaluating the appropriateness of the materials according to the criteria stipulated by BSNP (2007) in order to know the validity of the materials. The evaluation was done by the expert of materials. The questionnaire was distributed to evaluate the materials. The questionnaire covered four aspects namely the appropriateness of the content, the language, the presentation, and the graphic.

**Table 3. The Result of Expert Judgment**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | **Category** | **Name of the Unit** |
| **Unit 1** | **Unit 2** | **Unit 3** | **Unit 4** | **Unit 5** | **Unit 6** |
| 1 | Content | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | Language | 3.71 | 3.5 | 3.85 | 3.71 | 3.85 | 3.57 |
| 3 | Presentation | 3.84 | 3.84 | 3.92 | 3.84 | 3.76 | 3.92 |
| 4 | Graphic | 3.71 | 3.85 | 3.71 | 3.85 | 3.57 | 3.57 |
|  | **Average Score** | **3.81** | **3.80** | **3.87** | **3.85** | **3.79** | **3.76** |
|  | **Final means** | **3.81** |

The table above shows that the overall means of the materials was 3.81. Therefore, the means was in the range of x ≥ 3.53. It means that the result of the expert judgment shows that developed materials were very good and appropriate to be applied.

After implementing the materials, the researcher conducted an evaluation. The material evaluation was used to know the quality of the developed materials. The result of the evaluation was used to know whether the product was good or should be revised again. To obtain the data for the evaluation, the researcher used two instruments; those were the material evaluation questionnaire and the interview guideline.

The questionnaire covered some aspects which were the title of the unit, the objective of the unit, the content of the materials, the graphic of the materials, the learning activities, the language of the materials, the culture integration of the materials and the students’ response to the use of materials. The results of the materials evaluation questionnaire are described in the following table.

**Table 4. The Result of Materials Evaluation Questionnaire**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Aspects** | **Means Value** |
| 1. | The title of the unit | 3.77 |
| 2. | The objective of the unit | 3.75 |
| 3. | The content of the materials | 3.81 |
| 4. | The graphic of the materials | 3.81 |
| 5. | The learning activities | 3.84 |
| 6. | The language of the materials | 3.81 |
| 7. | The culture integration of the materials | 3.85 |
| 8. | The students’ response to the use of materials | 3.83 |
|  | **Final Means** | **3.81** |

The result of the mean above showed that the developed materials based on the students’ perspective was categorized as “very good” because it was in the range of x ≥ 3.53.

On the other hands, the result of the interview with students and the teacher showed the positive responds for them. They said that by using the developed book, students were interested to learn English by using Indonesian culture. Besides, they learnt about English, they also learnt about their own culture. The Integrated Performance Assessment also gave them challenging activities. Interpretive, interpersonal and presentational activities make them active in the teaching and learning process.

1. **Discussion**

This part presented the discussion based on the findings of the study. It is concerned with the appropriateness of the developed materials.

The developed materials were arranged based on the result of need analysis data. The data was got from the questionnaire which was given to the students. The questionnaire consists of some questions related to the learners’ needs and the target needs. The target needs refer to what learners need to do in the target situation. It consists of necessities, lacks, and wants in learning English. The learning needs are about the students’ opinion about what they should do to attain the target situation. It consists of input, procedures, teachers’ role, students’ role, and setting. This is congruent with Nunan (2004), he classified the task components into goal, input, procedures, teacher role and setting.

The appropriateness of the developed materials were analysed by the expert of the materials. The questionnaire for the expert consists of some questions related to the content of the materials, the language of the materials, the presentation of the materials, and the graphic of the materials. Based on the result of the questionnaire from the expert, the developed materials were categorized as “very good’ because the mean was 3.81. The materials was arranged by following the theory about how to design task that is proposed by Nunan (2004). According to him, in designing the tasks, there are some principles have to be followed. They are scaffolding, task dependency, recycling, active learning, integration, reproduction to creation and reflection.

Based on the result of the questionnaire for students about the responds of the developed materials, the mean of the result was 3.81. According to Suharto (2006), x ≥ 3.53 is categorized as very good. Conferring to Hutchinson and Waters (1987), the good materials do not teach learners but they encourage learners to learn. Good materials contain interesting texts, enjoyable activities which engage learners’ thinking capabilities, opportunities for learners to use their existing knowledge and skills, and content which both the learners and the teacher cope with.

The result of interview with students also gave the positive responds. The students said that the materials and activities were interesting for them. They want to learn with the developed materials again and again. They also like the topic of the texts in the book.

Furthermore, arranging activities which can make students active in the teaching and learning process is difficult. As Junior High School students are in a transition age, they are difficult to be understood. Harmer (2007: 83) said that adolescents are often seen as problem students. Nevertheless, they are who engaged, have a great capacity to learn, a great potential for creativity and a passionate commitment to things which interest them.

In order to arrange interesting and engaging activities, the researcher use Integrated Performance Assessment. By following IPA modes of communication, the researcher arranged materials which based on what they would be assessed. According to Adair Hauck, Glisan, and Troyan (2013), IPA enables learners to demonstrate their ability to communicate within specific goal areas of the National standards across the interpretive, interpersonal, and presentational. The result of questionnaire for students especially about the activities showed that they interest and feel challenging with the materials.

Finally, according to the considerations above, it can be said that the developed materials were appropriate to be implemented. Since the materials were developed based on what students’ needs and evaluated by the expert. It also evaluated by the students and the teacher. The result of evaluation also showed positive responds for them.
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