

## Developing Entrance Ticket and Exit Card as Formative Assessment for Promoting Learner Autonomy of Struggling Students

Yogyantoro

University of Rochester, New York

yogya\_ntr@yahoo.co.id

### Abstract

*Struggling students risk leaving school without having the opportunity to develop their independence to become less reliant on others. This study aims to gain insights into how formative assessment as a teaching design can support self-regulated learning (SRL) among struggling students. Entrance Ticket and Exit Card are short prompts that can provide instructors with a quick student diagnostic. These exercises can be collected on 6"x4" cards or small pieces of paper. Formative assessment is most effective when administered often. Efficiency is ensured when the information identified is evaluated immediately and the results are applied directly in the next lesson. The study was conducted to determine the perceptions of students and experts regarding using entrance tickets and exit cards for promoting students' learning autonomy. This ADDIE research and development study was conducted to develop entrance tickets and exit cards. After the product was created, a quasi-experimental design was used to determine the product's effectiveness toward learner autonomy. The result revealed feasible evaluations from the students and the experts regarding the product. Statistical processes using the independent t-test analysis in comparing the achievement between the control and experimental groups showed significant differences between the groups based on the "Independent Samples Test" output table in the "Equal variances not assumed" row, it is generated that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) of  $0.00 < 0.05$ . The experimental group showed above average with overall total mean score of 3.846 level of learner autonomy. The implications of this study extend to teachers, students, and future researchers, providing valuable insights and directions for the advancement and improvement of language education.*

### Keywords

assessment; entrance tickets; exit cards; learner autonomy



### I. Introduction

Language assessment is a continuous and diverse process of collecting information and making judgments about a learner's knowledge of a language and ability to use it (Schmitt, 2010; Hyland, 2003). There are some kinds of assessment. Berry (2005, p.55) stated that assessment of learning is the assessment that becomes public and results in statements or symbols about how well students are learning". It often contributes to pivotal decisions that will affect students' futures. It is important, then, that the underlying logic and measurement of assessment of learning be credible and defensible.

While Earl (2012) defined the assessment of learning as an assessment that has a summative purpose. It documents the learning report about the student's improvement by giving them the rank. It is usually conducted at the end of a particular time unit. Moreover,

the questions are taken from the material had studied before. Berry, R. (2005, p.55) also mentioned some of the teachers' roles in the assessment of learning that "Teachers have the responsibility of reporting student learning accurately and fairly, based on evidence obtained from a variety of contexts and applications. Even though many writers use the terms "assessment for learning" and "formative assessment" interchangeably, some practitioners differ between the assessments. Klenowski, V. (2009) defined assessment for learning as a daily exercise by students, teachers, and peers searching for about and responding reflection of the materials given, application, and observation to enhance the ongoing process.

Even though empirical research has proved positive impacts of formative assessment on instructional processes, research into this promising area has received much less attention than it deserves in education and language instruction (Abedi, 2010; Bailey, 2017). For example, in a recent study on formative assessment (Tsulaia & Adamia, 2020), the majority of the participant lecturers reported that they did not use formative assessment tools in their teaching.

Entrance Ticket and Exit Card are short prompts that can provide instructors with a quick student diagnostic. These exercises can be collected on 6"x4" cards or small pieces of paper, or online through a survey or course management system. On the concept of exit and entrance slips, Lemov (2010) refers to the 'Exit Slip/Ticket' concept as a closure technique whereby students need to answer a question in order to leave the classroom. Marzano (2012) discusses four types of prompts with each having a different intended outcome: prompt that provides formative assessment data, prompt that stimulates student self-analysis, prompt that focuses on instructional strategies, and prompt that communicates with the teacher.

At the end of most lessons, we used exit cards as a way to evaluate student takeaways from the lesson. Another form of formative assessment, less formal than the exit cards, were the questions that we planned for different points throughout each lesson. In addition to reviewing exit cards, we also discussed students' sense-making. We often used what we learned about students' sense-making from exit cards as we constructed the next day's "engage" part of the lesson to ensure that we were building on students' ideas rather than presenting a series of activities that were conceptually incoherent.

For several reasons such as lack of pedagogical skills, large class sizes and reluctance, educators tend to neglect the application of formative assessment when teaching. Thus, the practice of formative assessment in actual courses is not in line with the provisions in the policy document. Many teachers incorporate aspects of formative assessment into their teaching, but it is less common to find it practised systematically. If formative assessment is used as a framework for teaching, teachers change the way they interact with students, how they set up learning situations and guide students toward learning goals, even how they define student success.

Several countries promote formative assessment as a fundamental approach to education reform. The OECD has studied the use of formative assessment in eight educational systems: Australia (Queensland), Canada, Denmark, England, Finland, Italy, New Zealand and Scotland. The study has also brought together reviews covering English, French and German language research literature. This Policy Brief looks at the results of that study, including policy principles to address barriers to formative assessment and encourage its wider use (OECD (2005)). Solving problems is considered challenging for students with ID, yet it is important since situations that require problem solving arise in everyone's lives. Thus, teaching problem-solving gives students opportunities to develop a lifelong learning competence (Raley et al., 2020). The present study suggests that a

formative classroom practice might support students with ID to develop their self-regulation and problem-solving abilities, which will be useful in adult life.

Effective assessment is needed to provide effective answers to all these critical questions. Tests and examinations are a classic way of measuring student progress and are integral to accountability of schools and the education system. These highly visible forms of tracking progress, known as “summative assessment” are also used by parents and employers. But this is only part of the story. To be truly effective, assessment should also be “formative” in other words, identifying and responding to the students’ learning needs. In classrooms featuring formative assessment, teachers make frequent, interactive assessments of student understanding. This enables them to adjust their teaching to meet individual student needs, and to better help all students to reach high standards. Teachers also actively involve students in the process, helping them to develop skills that enable them to learn better.

Based on problems above, the researcher limiting the research on developing formative assessment in English Language Teaching at seventh grade students of SMPN 2 Suruh. The learning activities in the work units will improve students to use the target language fluently. Based on the limitation of problems above, the researcher formulates the research problem as follows:

1. What are the perceptions of the students’ and experts regarding the use of entrance tickets and exit cards for promoting students’ learning autonomy?
2. How effective is the entrance tickets and exit cards in promoting students’ learning autonomy?

The objectives of this research and development are:

1. To determine the perceptions of the students and experts regarding the use of entrance tickets and exit cards for promoting learner autonomy
2. To determine the effectiveness of the entrance tickets and exit cards in promoting students’ learning autonomy.

The significance of this study is expected to contribute several benefits in the English language teaching quality. There are two significance contributions gain from this study. They are follows:

a. Theoretical Significances

The result of this study is expected to give contribution to the development of knowledge especially in the field of education. This study expected to be a reference and an alternative source in conducting formative assessment related to the use of Entrance Ticket and Exit Card.

b. Practical Significances

The result of this study is expected to be beneficial for the teachers, the students, and other researchers.

1. For the teacher

Through this study, the teachers can enrich their knowledge about techniques or strategies for formative assessment. It can provide idea and inspiration for the teachers on how to conduct formative assessment.

2. For the students

This study is also beneficial for the students. It is directly intended to create effective formative assessment that let students to explore and develop their learning.

3. For other Researchers

This study is expected to be useful other researchers as a reference to implement the Entrance Ticket and Exit Card in formative assessment.

## II. Review of Literature

Struggling learners are students who encounter difficulties in their learning journey for various reasons, such as a lack of foundational knowledge or skills, executive functioning challenges, attention and focus issues, and emotional and behavioural difficulties. These students may have a diagnosis of a learning difference, may not be formally diagnosed or do not meet all criteria for a diagnosis but require additional support to reach their full potential. After many years of reform efforts, educators are still searching for ways to better serve the needs of struggling students. Teachers are utilizing the same strategies and teaching approaches without seeing much improvement or student success. Struggling students found that teachers who seemed not to care, as well as being too busy and not available to listen, caused them to be unhappy. This coupled with the teacher not taking individual circumstances or problems at home into account when disciplining students often led to disengagement and frustration (Lagana-Riordan et al., 2011).

Information obtained in such a way helps the teacher to plan and further improve his/her instruction. Not only does the teacher assess the learners' progress, he/she also assesses the state of his/her own teaching. Thus, the information provided by the assessment is intended not only for the teacher but also for the learner. The teacher informs the learner on the level of his/her development and at the same time, such information has an incentive effect for the learner (Kompolt, 2010, p. 158). This kind of assessment, according to Gavora (2010, p. 16), corresponds with the current trends in learners' assessment. The assessment model focused on learner's errors has been being abandoned and the attention has been shifting to the facilitation and the development of the learner. At the same time, a thesis has been postulated to make the learner an active subject of assessment. The learner should act not only as the person being assessed but also as the one doing the assessment. Learners should observe, examine and evaluate their own activity and behaviour. Their self-reflection shall be facilitated, which should lead to a realistic self-image. This is so-called autonomous assessment (Slavík, 1999, pp. 133-139).

Data from similar activities taking place at schools are extremely important for improving teaching as well as learning. They show learners how to learn and study; they encourage teachers to analyse objectively what was going on in the classroom; and they encourage learners to do self-assessment and assess their own learning process. We used the formative assessment techniques listed below while teaching at university. In various modified forms, they are also used at primary and secondary schools. Formative assessment provides information that can be used for the purpose of improving the content of the course as well as for improving the teaching methods and, ultimately, the learners' learning.

For learners, formative assessment techniques can help develop self-assessment and learning management skills, reduce feelings of isolation and impotence, increase understanding and ability to think critically about the course and ensure long-term retention of information acquired. According to Hamodi et al. (2015), the evaluation tools are the tools used by teachers and students to capture in an organized way the information collected by a certain technique.

- 1) Validity and Reliability and Evaluation Instruments. The validity shows the degree of accuracy with which it is intended to measure the intended objective. Reliability refers to the consistency of its results, implies that the instrument delivers similar products when its application is repeated in the same situations and individuals (Drago, 2017). Reliability is a necessary means, but not sufficient for validity. One test may be to get a

very accurate measure, but something that was not in the interest of evaluating. Therefore, the first thing that must be preserved is authenticity, considering the practice as an educational achievement.

- 2) Means, techniques, and formative assessment instruments. By conceptualizing these terms, they may be confused with each other, figure 1 explicitly details what the formative assessment instruments are.

Riley and Gremmo (1995) say that autonomous learners become highly motivated and that autonomy leads to more, effective work. However, Knowles (1975: 14) takes a step further when he affirms that “there is convincing evidence that people who take the initiative in learning (proactive learners) learn more things and learn better than do people who sit at the feet of teachers, passively waiting to be taught (reactive learners). They enter into learning more purposefully and with greater motivation.” Holec (1981) discusses the broad, salient features of an autonomous learner. They are characterized by their understanding the purpose of their learning programme, explicitly accepting responsibility for their learning, setting their learning goals, taking initiatives in planning and executing their learning activities, regularly reviewing their learning.

However, Nunan (2003) identifies a key component of the learner-centred classroom: “learners to identify their own learning styles and strategies.” Little (2007) formulates the qualities of an autonomous learner when he defines them as one who must “develop a capacity for detachment, critical reflection, decision making, and independent action.” On the concept of Entrance Ticket and Exit Card, Lemov (2010) refers to the ‘Exit Slip/Card’ concept as a closure technique whereby students need to answer a question in order to leave the classroom. Marzano (2012) discusses four types of prompts with each having a different intended outcome: prompt that provides formative assessment data, prompt that stimulates student self-analysis, prompt that focuses on instructional strategies, and prompt that communicates with the teacher.

Autonomous learners need to be proactive, reflective, and communicative. At the same time, for learners to become autonomous, they require certain basic preconditions like an insight, a positive attitude, a capacity for reflection, a readiness to self-manage, and a willingness to interact with others. In other words, the practice of learner autonomy involves cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and other social dimensions of language learning. However, learner autonomy is beneficial in three ways: one, if learners are reflectively engaged with their learning, their learning will become efficient and effective because learning is focused and personal; two, proactive learning solves the problem of motivation; and three, when they use the language either in written or spoken, they succeed in communication. Exit Cards are written responses from students to questions teachers pose at the end of the class. This quick, informal assessment enables teachers to quickly assess learners’ understanding of the unit taught. In fact, such responses promote the various skills: one, teachers understand the extent to which learners have grasped the subject taught; two, learners can reflect over what they have learnt; three, learners can express in writing what they are thinking about new information; four, they can hone their simple writing skills; five, students can think critically.

Exit Cards can make learners autonomous in the sense that they begin to self-manage their learning processes. Therefore, some of the strategies that teachers can think of are as follows: (1). Teachers can keep note cards ready for the entire semester so that students can be asked to write down three things they learnt from the class, two questions they have about the unit/lecture, and one thing about what they felt about their class that day. (2). Teachers can create a quick multiple-choice quiz to assess students’ understanding. (3). Students create their own quiz questions. (4). Either students can quiz each other, or the

teacher can compile all the quiz questions so that they can create a quiz as an Entrance slip for the next day's class. (5). Students can write a brief summary in five to seven sentences of their learning and can reserve to those who are absent. They can share through groups created in the WhatsApp. (6). Each can share with the other person in pairs what they wrote in the Entrance slip and if there was any change in the present class. (7). They can make a graphic representation of their learning and share it with others through various media. The major objective behind such an exercise is that closure of a class/unit/lesson should be meaningful and it should not be abrupt either from teacher's end or from a learner's side. The classroom should be participatory, meaningful, interactive, and learner-centered, but learning-oriented.

A timely review of the Exit Cards may determine the extent to which teachers can alter their instruction so that learners' needs can be met. Teachers can also collect all the Exit Cards individually and keep them as part of an assessment portfolio for every individual student. This can indicate a reliable, meaningful, longitudinal assessment of the individual's progress in terms of general cognitive development and language learning. Exit Cards expect learners to be proactive and responsible in their learning. It promotes their autonomy. Learners can be independent of teachers, but inter-dependent among themselves. Ultimately, it leads to peer-learning and self-reflection. Self-reflection encourages them to be responsible and this sense of responsibility improves their performance. Above all, they stay motivated. Incidentally, exit slips are a valuable tool to teacher reflection and professional growth. They begin to self-evaluate their own teaching effectiveness. Reflecting on one's own practice is vital to being an effective teacher.

An entrance ticket is also a student response to a question that teachers pose related to the upcoming or the previous instruction. It provides teaches what students already know and their belief system. It also provides information to teachers regarding individual needs and strengths and their current level of understanding. Teaching and learning then become customized and personalized. It prepares students to be involved throughout the instruction through attention and interaction. Students come to class prepared and academically engaged. Academic disengagement, lack of motivation, and non-involvement characterize the present-day students in English language classes. Entrance Ticket and Exit Card can effectively erase these social-psychological problems.

### **III. Research Methods**

In this study researcher used research and development method. According to Sugiyono (2014:407) research and development method is a method used to produce a certain product, and test the effectiveness of the product. Furthermore Gall, et. al (2003:45) stated that basically research and development have two main objectives, they are: (1) to develop a product and (2) to test the effectiveness of the product. This study conducted to develop formative assessment through entrance ticket and exit card for VII grade of Junior High.

There are several models in developing a multimedia-based teaching media e.g Brog & Gall model, Hoge, et. al., model, Hannafin & Peck model, Criswell model, ADDIE (Analyse, Design, Develop, Implement, Evaluate) model, CBI (Computer Based Instruction) model, and so on. However, in this study the writer used ADDIE model. ADDIE stands for Analyze, Design, Develop, Implement, and Evaluate. ADDIE is a product development paradigm applied to intentional learning environments (Branch, 2009; Bakala & Bakala, 2020). ADDIE facilitates the complexities of deliberate learning environments by responding to multiple situations and interactions within and between

contexts. ADDIE focuses on performing authentic tasks, complex knowledge, and genuine problems that promote high fidelity between learning environments and actual work settings.

The study will use a quasi-experimental design to measure the effectiveness of using the Entrance Tickets and Exit cards to promote learner autonomy skills among Indonesian junior high school students. Quasi-experimental research designs employ nonexperimental variation in the primary independent variable of interest, emulating experimental conditions in which some subjects are randomly exposed to treatment, and others are not (Gopalan et al., 2020). The quasi-experimental designs also make it possible to conduct rigorous studies with non-random sampling (Miller et al., 2020)..

#### IV. Result and Discussion

The study employs a semi-structured interview and document analysis to conduct the need analysis of the entrance ticket and exit card development. The semi-structured interview investigates the teacher's perceptions of learning autonomy and its practice, student competency, supporting facilities, materials, and learner autonomy aspect of the students. Moreover, document analysis is conducted to investigate the appropriate assessment to be assigned as formatif assessment using entrance tickets and exit cards for the determined population.

The researcher conducted a semi-structured interview on the first of April, 2023. The semi-structured interview is assigned to a seventh-grade English teacher at SMPN 2 Suruh in Trenggalek Regency, who has taught English for about nine years. The semi-structured interview revealed some essential points as a consideration in designing the entrance tickets and exit cards.

In relation to the students' learner autonomy, the teacher stated that only 15 % of the students show learner autonomy behaviour. The teacher also stated that she embeds learner autonomy by instructing the students to learn the materials before or after they have been implemented in the classroom. The teacher also emphasized the importance of learner autonomy toward student's learning achievement. The teacher also stated students' interest in entrance tickets and exit cards material.

**Table 1.** Experts' Evaluation means score

Aspects	No	Categories	X
<b>Language</b>	1	The suitability of the language level with the students' development	4.5
	2	Language is clear and comprehensible.	4.5
	3	The suitability of language used in explanation and tasks direction with the students' cognitive development	4.5
	4	The language used grammatically correct	4.5
Total			4.5
<b>Content</b>	1	Entrance tickets and exit cards developed in accordance with learning objectives	5
	2	Entrance tickets and exit cards developed in accordance with the students' need in learning.	5
	3	Entrance tickets and exit cards developed exploring a lot of text related to students'	5

		daily life	
	4	In general, the entrance tickets and exit cards provided a clear explanation	4.5
	5	The questions given in the entrance tickets and exit cards can help students understand the main topic	5
	6	Questions in entrance tickets and exit cards were taken from sources relevant to the topic being discussed	5
	7	Questions in entrance tickets and exit cards were taken from up-to-date sources	5
	8	The forms of questions in entrance tickets and exit cards are presented in various ways	4.5
		Total	4.875
<b>Layout</b>	1	The layout of questions is attractive	5
	2	The questions on entrance tickets and exit cards follow a consistent pattern	5
	3	The illustrations provided can enlarge understanding of the information conveyed	4
	4	The illustration given has a proportional size so that it provides an accurate picture of the object in question	4
	5	In general, the illustrations are shown in accordance with the topic of discussion	5
	6	The developed worksheet does not use lots of fonts	5
	7	The material uses letter variations (bold, italic, capital) to distinguish levels and emphasize the text that is considered important	4.5
		Total	4.643
		Total means score of the experts' evaluation	4.673

As displayed in Table 1 the average scores for each item indicate that the language aspect of the entrance tickets and exit cards was highly rated by the participants, with all items receiving scores of 4.50. The total mean score of 4.50 suggests that the language aspect of the entrance tickets and exit cards was very feasible and effective. The high ratings across all categories indicate that the language used in the entrance tickets and exit cards was well-suited to the participants' needs, clear, comprehensible, and grammatically correct. These findings indicate that the language aspect of the entrance tickets and exit cards played a crucial role in promoting effective and successful learning experiences. Moreover, one of the experts noticed a minor grammatical error in the entrance tickets and exit cards, which is still tolerable. In addition, the second expert emphasized the importance of clearly stated targeted users in the entrance tickets and exit cards.

As for the aspect of content, the average scores for each item indicate that the content of entrance tickets and exit cards was highly rated by the participants, with all items receiving scores of 4.50 or higher. Six items (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7) received perfect scores of 5.00, indicating that the material questions were highly feasible and effective in various



aspects. This suggests that the questions were developed in accordance with the learning objectives and the students' needs in the speaking course. Additionally, the material questions explored texts related to students' daily lives, provided clear explanations, contained material with clear pronunciation, and helped students understand the main topics. The teaching materials were taken from relevant and up-to-date sources, and the material consistently presented pre-activity and main activity on each unit.

Overall, the total mean score of 4.643 suggests that the material questions of the entrance tickets and exit cards was very feasible and effective. The high ratings across most categories indicate that the material questions were well-developed, aligned with learning objectives and student needs, explored relevant and up-to-date sources, and provided clear explanations and materials. These findings indicate that the material questions played a crucial role in promoting effective and engaging learning experiences. For the feedback, the expert stated that some revisions should be conducted to make the placement between the texts and the illustrations to make them more connected. The second expert suggested questions for the student to help them comprehend the contexts and situations, especially for the longer part.

In terms of the layout of the entrance tickets and exit cards, the average scores for each item indicate that the layout of the entrance tickets and exit cards was highly rated by the participants, with two categories received 4, one category receiving scores of 4.50 or higher, and five categories received perfect scores of 5.00, indicating that all the items in the layout evaluation were considered very feasible except the illustration proportion and the use of the fonts, which are feasible criteria.

Overall, the total mean score of 4.673 suggests that the layout of the entrance tickets and exit cards was feasible and effective. The ratings across most categories indicate that the placement of layout elements was consistent, the use of fonts and letter variations was appropriate. These findings suggest that the entrance tickets and exit cards' layout should be able to facilitate easy navigation, visual appeal, and effective communication of information to the students as perceived by the experts. Regarding the experts' feedback, one of the experts stated that proper placement would make the entrance tickets and exit cards better proportionate. In contrast, the other experts encouraged using bigger fonts to increase readability.

**Table 2.** Descriptive Statistics of Pre-test and Post-test Scores of Control and Experimental Group

		<b>Control Group Speaking Pre-test</b>	<b>Control Group Speaking Post-test</b>	<b>Experimental Group Speaking Pre-test</b>	<b>Experimental Group Speaking Post-test</b>
<b>N</b>	Valid	13	13	13	13
	Missing	0	0	0	0
	Mean	35.38	38.50	34.69	61.50
	Median	35.57	38.45	34.54	62.05
	Modus	42.75	38.40	38.00	64.90
	Std. Deviation	6.25	4.67	4.75	8.08
	Minimum	22.20	30.80	25.80	43.90

The post-test was assigned for the experimental and control group on November 12, 2023. The experimental group scored a mean of 61.50 on the post-test, whereas the control group scored only 38.50. The experimental and control groups improved for the post-test

compared to the pre-test score. In contrast, the changes in the post-test score in the experimental group are higher than in the control group. The changes have made the experimental group score surpass the average of the control group score. Based on the post-test results for both groups, the entrance ticket and exit card positively influences the student's speaking skills.

The post-test was assigned for the experimental and control group on November 12, 2023. The post-test comprised 15 responsive speaking questions and 6 extensive speaking questions. The post-test result was analyzed using Pearson correlation to measure the question's validity. The score of the Pearson correlation analysis or the *r*-count value was compared to the *r*-table value. If the value of the *r*-count is smaller than the *r*-table value, the question is not valid. Based on the *r*-table value with 26 samples, the value is 0.388. Therefore, if the *r*-count score is more than 0.388, it is considered valid (Table 3). Based on the Pearson correlation analysis, 12 from 21 questions were valid. They are questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, 18, and 20.

**Table 3.** The Post-test Question's Validity

<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Type of Speaking Skill</b>	<b><i>r</i>-count</b>	<b>Validity</b>
1	Responsive	0.629	Valid
2	Responsive	0.583	Valid
3	Responsive	0.567	Valid
4	Responsive	0.667	Valid
5	Responsive	0.132	Not valid
6	Responsive	0.569	Valid
7	Responsive	0.594	Valid
8	Responsive	0.561	Valid
9	Responsive	0.358	Not valid
10	Responsive	0.135	Not valid
11	Responsive	0.177	Not valid
12	Responsive	0.596	Valid
13	Responsive	0.584	Valid
14	Responsive	0.235	Not valid
15	Responsive	0.579	Valid
16	Extensive	0.151	Not valid
17	Extensive	0.033	Not valid
18	Extensive	0.561	Valid
19	Extensive	0.381	Not valid
20	Extensive	0.701	Valid
21	Extensive	0.352	Not valid

After determining the question's validity, the researcher assigned Chronbach alpha to measure the reliability of the 12 valid questions. If the alpha value is less than 0.6, the reliability is not acceptable, whereas if it is greater than 0.6, it is acceptable (Shamsuddin et al., 2015; Hair et al., 2019). Based on the Cronbach alpha analysis, the reliability of all the questions was in moderate criterion (Table 4). It means that the reliability of the twelve questions was acceptable.

**Table 4.** The Post-test Question's Reliability

Question Number	Type of Speaking Skill	$\alpha$	Criteria
1	Responsive	0.711	moderate
2	Responsive	0.725	moderate
3	Responsive	0.718	moderate
4	Responsive	0.708	moderate
5	Responsive	0.749	moderate
6	Responsive	0.720	moderate
7	Responsive	0.717	moderate
8	Responsive	0.719	moderate
9	Responsive	0.734	moderate
10	Responsive	0.748	moderate
11	Responsive	0.759	moderate
12	Responsive	0.714	moderate
13	Responsive	0.727	moderate
14	Responsive	0.753	moderate
15	Responsive	0.716	moderate
16	Extensive	0.753	moderate
17	Extensive	0.762	moderate
18	Extensive	0.719	moderate
19	Extensive	0.733	moderate
20	Extensive	0.734	moderate
21	Extensive	0.735	moderate

Based on the validity and reliability of the post-test, the researcher then conducted a normality test for the result of the twelve questions on SPSS 25. The normality test was conducted to fulfill the requirement to perform the independent sample t-test as a parametric statistic (Sugiyono, 2015). Because the df value is less than 50, the assumption for the normality of the test was taken from the Shapiro-Wilk section (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012). It was concluded that the post-test result was normal in distribution, based on the p-value of the control group, which was 0.617, and the experimental group, which was 0.753, that was more than 0.05 (Table 5).

**Table 5.** The normality of the post-test

		Tests of Normality					
		Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Kelas	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Score Total Post Test	Control Group	.150	13	.200 <sup>*</sup>	.951	13	.617
	Experimental Group	.139	13	.200 <sup>*</sup>	.960	13	.753

\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

After the normality assumed, the researcher compared the means between the result of the twelve valid and reliable questions to analyse the significant difference between the experimental group and the control group post-test results. The researcher employed an independent sample t-test in SPSS 25 to the significant difference.

Based on the SPSS output, it is known that the value of Sig. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances is 0.125, which was bigger than 0.05, so it can be interpreted that the

data variance between the experimental and control groups is homogeneous (Shava et al., 2017). The interpretation of the independent samples t-test output table (Table 6) is guided by the values comprised in the "Equal variances not assumed" table. Based on the "Independent Samples Test" output table in the "Equal variances not assumed" row, it is generated that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) of  $0.00 < 0.05$ , then it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the average students' post-test in the experimental and control groups, suggesting a significant improvement in the speaking skills of the experimental group after the implementation of the entrance tickets and exit cards.

**Table 6.** Independent Sample T-Test Post-Test Analysis Group Statistics

	Kelas	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score Total Post Test	Control Group	13	38.5000	4.66869	1.29486
	Experimental Group	13	61.4992	8.08137	2.24137

  

Independent Samples Test						
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Score Total Post Test	Equal variances assumed	2.532	.125	-8.885	24	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.885	19.207	.000

t-test for Equality of Means			
Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper
-22.99923	2.58851	-28.34166	-17.65680
-22.99923	2.58851	-28.41310	-17.58536

An adapted questionnaire consisted of nine statements from Nhat (2021) was used to measure the students learner autonomy level in the experimental group after the implementation of the entrance tickets and exit cards. The questionnaire was assigned to the group on June 12, 2023. Prior to that the questionnaire's validity and reliability were evaluated. The value is 0.553 based on the r-table value with 13 samples. Therefore, if the r-count score is greater than 0.553, the statement is valid. In addition, for the reliability the score is similar or more than 0.6 to be accepted. The Pearson correlation indicated all the statements in the learner autonomy questionnaire are valid. The r-count value is between 0.659 to 0.906. Moreover, the Cronbach alpha indicated that all the statements met excellent reliability criteria (Table.7).

**Table 7.** The Validity and Reliability of Learner Autonomy Questionnaire

No	Statements	r-count	Validity	$\alpha$	Reliability Criteria
1	I can find learning materials independently.	0.659	valid	0.916	Excellent

2	I feel more active and motivated to learn English.	0.906	valid	0.896	Excellent
3	I can access learning materials anytime, anywhere.	0.811	valid	0.906	Excellent
4	I am aware of the objectives of tasks instructed in the entrance tickets and exit cards.	0.782	valid	0.908	Excellent
5	I feel more curious when doing the instructions in the entrance tickets and exit cards.	0.831	valid	0.904	Excellent
6	I can select and implement appropriate learning strategies.	0.659	valid	0.916	Excellent
7	I am able to formulate my own learning objectives.	0.670	valid	0.917	Excellent
8	I can monitor my own learning.	0.831	valid	0.904	Excellent
9	I can monitor and evaluate my own use of learning strategies.	0.811	valid	0.906	Excellent

After measuring the validity and reliability of the learner autonomy questionnaire, the next stage was calculating the mean score (X) of the questionnaire result. The participants' learner autonomy after using the entrance tickets and exit cards, the arithmetic means (X) was calculated using the Likert scale data. These methods revealed the students' learner autonomy score after following the entrance tickets and exit cards instructions. Five of the nine questions 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9, were in average criteria, while questions number 1,2, 6, and 7 were above average. For the total mean, it was revealed that the score was 3.846. It was concluded that the level of learner autonomy of the participants after following the entrance tickets and exit cards was above average (Table 8).

**Table 8.** Students' Learner Autonomy

No	Statements	X	Criteria
1	I can find learning materials independently.	3.846	above average
2	I feel more active and motivated to learn English	3.538	above average
3	I can access learning materials anytime, anywhere.	3.462	average
4	I am aware of the objectives of tasks instructed in the entrance tickets and exit cards.	3.385	average
5	I feel more curious when doing the instructions in the entrance tickets and exit cards.	3.385	average
6	I can select and implement appropriate learning strategies.	3.846	above average
7	I am able to formulate my own learning objectives.	3.692	above average
8	I can monitor my own learning.	3.385	average
9	I can monitor and evaluate my own	3.462	average

use of learning strategies.		
Total	3.846	above average

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the entrance tickets and exit cards had a positive impact on promoting learner autonomy among the participants. The calculation of mean scores for the learner autonomy questionnaire indicated that the majority of the questions (3,4, 5, 8, 9) received average scores. While four questions (1, 2, 6 and 7) had above average scores, the overall total mean score of 3.846 suggested that the participants' level of learner autonomy, after following the entrance tickets and exit cards instructions, was above average. These results provide evidence that the entrance tickets and exit cards effectively contributed to enhancing learner autonomy.

## V. Conclusion

After having formative assessment: entrance tickets and exit cards, it can be concluded that using entrance tickets and exit cards had a positive impact to 7<sup>th</sup> grade students in SMPN 2 Suruh. Related to the discussion and analysis in the last chapter, it can conclude that: when the researcher uses entrance tickets and exit cards, students made a positive response due to the learning activity in the classroom. Students are also more interest in learning English because the used of formative assessment: entrance tickets and exit cards in the learning activity. the evaluation conducted by students has indicated the feasibility of the entrance tickets and exit cards, as they found it to be suitable for their learning needs.

Similarly, experts' evaluation has generally recognized the entrance tickets and exit cards as a feasible learning resource, although some revisions have been suggested to further improve its effectiveness. The positive perceptions expressed by both students and experts regarding the entrance tickets and exit cards reinforce its feasibility and value as an instructional tool. The alignment of students' feedback and experts' evaluation affirms the significance of the entrance tickets and exit cards in facilitating formative assessment, effective learning experiences and promoting language development. The entrance has demonstrated its significance in supporting learner autonomy. Based on the findings, it helps to foster independent learning and empower students to take charge of their language development.

## References

- Aldoobie, N. (2015). ADDIE Model Nada. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research ADDIE*, 5(6), 68–72. <https://ph02.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/itm-journal/article/view/240513>
- Black P. and D. Wiliam (1998), “Assessment and Classroom learning”, *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice, CARFAX, Oxfordshire*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 7-74. ISSN: 0969-594X
- Borg W.R. and Gall,MD (1983). *Educational research: an introduction*. New York: Longman, Inc
- Branch, R. M. (2009). *Instructional Design: The ADDIE Approach*. In *Encyclopedia of Evolutionary Psychological Science*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-09506-6>
- Brown, H.D (2004). *Language assessment: principles and Classroom practices*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education

- Burke, K. M., Raley, S. K., Shogren, K. A., Hagiwara, M., Mumbardó-Adam, C., Uyanik, H., et al. (2020). A meta-analysis of interventions to promote self-determination for students with disabilities. *Remedial Spec. Educ.* 41, 176–188. doi: 10.1177/0741932518802274
- Deborah, J.B. 2010. *How to Design Feasibility Studies*. London: National Institutes of Health. *Am J Prev.*
- Dr, P. (2008). *Sugiyono, Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*. CV. Alfabeta, Bandung, 25
- Drago, C. (2017). *Manual de apoyo docente: evaluación para el aprendizaje*. Santiago de Chile: Editorial Universidad Central de Chile.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Fisher, D., and Frey, N. (2004). *Improving Adolescent Literacy: Strategies at Work*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Fulcher, Glenn.2003. *Testing Second Language Speaking*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.
- Gopalan, M., Rosinger, K., & Ahn, J. Bin. (2020). Use of Quasi-Experimental Research Designs in Education Research: Growth, Promise, and Challenges. *Review of Research in Education*, 44(1), 218–243. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X20903302>
- Greenstein, L. (2010). *Formative assessment: What teachers really need to know*. Virginia, USA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development [ASCD].
- Haryudin, A., & Jamilah, S. A. (2018). Teacher’S Difficulties in Teaching Speaking Using Audio Visual Aid for Autistic Students. *ELTIN JOURNAL, Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 6(2), 107. <https://doi.org/10.22460/eltin.v6i2.p107-116>
- Hamodi, C., López Pastor, VM, & López Pastor, AT (2015). Means, techniques and instruments of formative and shared evaluation of learning in higher education. *Educational Profiles*, 37 (147), 146-161.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon. <https://dasint.org.sg/learning-differently/learning-differently-s/struggling-learners>
- Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, 31(2), 217-230. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(03\)00021-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00021-6)
- Knowles, M. 1975. *Self-directed learning: a guide for learners and teachers*. Cambridge: Englewood Cliffs.OM
- Lagana-Riordan, C., Aguilar, J. P., Franklin, C., Streeter, C. L., Kim, J. S., Tripodi, S. J., & Hopson, L. M. (2011). At-risk students’ perceptions of traditional schools and a solution- focused public alternative school. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 55(3), 105–114. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10459880903472843>
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner Autonomy 1: Definitions, Issues and Problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Marzano, R. (2012). The Many Uses of Exit Slips. *Educational Leadership*, [online] 70.2.:80-81. Available at: <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educationalLeadership/oct12/vol70/num02/The-Many-Uses-of-Exit-Slips.aspx> [Accessed 20 December 2015]
- Marzano, R. (2012). The Many Uses of Exit Slips. *Educational Leadership*, [online] 70.2.:80-81.
- Mitchell, S. (2023). *Fostering Autonomy in Japanese Learners*. United International

- Journal for Research & Technology, 4(03), 67–70. UIJRT.COM
- Miller, C. J., Smith, S. N., & Pugatch, M. (2020). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs in implementation research. *Psychiatry Research*, 283(June 2019), 112452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2019.06.027>
- Nagai, N., Birch, G. C., Bower, J. V., & Schmidt, M. G. (2020). *CEFR-informed Learning, Teaching and Assessment A Practical Guide*. Springer Texts in Education. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-5894-8>
- Nunan, D. (Ed.). (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGraw Hill
- OECD (2005), *Formative Assessment: Improving Learning in Secondary Classrooms*, Paris, ISBN: 92-64-00739-3, price: 43 €, 282 p
- Oluwatayo, J. A. (2012). Validity and Reliability Issues in Educational Research. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 2(May), 391–400. <https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2012.v2n2.391>
- Patel, R., Tarrant, C., Bonas, S. et al. (2 more authors) (2015) The struggling student: a thematic analysis from the self-regulated learning perspective. *Medical Education*, 49 (4). pp. 417-426. ISSN 0308-0110
- Ramadhiyah, S., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2019). Exploring EFL learner autonomy in the 2013 Curriculum implementation. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 231–240. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i1.15626>
- Raufovich, S. R., & Qizi, Z. P. (2022). Developing The Language Skills. Receptive And Productive Skills Sayfullin. *O‘zbekistonda Fanlararo Innovatsiyalar Va Ilmiy Tadqiqotlar Jurnalı*, 2(13), 179–183. <https://bestpublication.org/index.php/ozf/article/view/1738>
- Pasek de Pinto, E., & Mejía, MT (2017). General process for formative assessment of learning. *Ibero-American Journal of Educational Evaluation*.
- Riley, R & Gremmo, M. 1995. Autonomy, self-direction, and self-access in language teaching and learning: the history of an idea. *System*, 23.2: 151-64.
- Science and Children, July 2019, Vol. 56, No. 9, Formative Assessment (July 2019), pp. 28-37
- Songbatumis, A. M. (2017). Challenges in Teaching English Faced by English Teachers at MTsN Taliwang, Indonesia. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.2223>
- Suriaman, A., Bin-Tahir, S. Z., & Usman, S. (2019). Asian EFL Journal Research Articles. Vol. 23 Issue No. 3.3 May 2019. *Asian EFL Journal Research Articles*, 23(3), 28–40. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343222181%0ADesigning>
- Tran, T. B. T., & Vuong, T. K. (2022). Factors Affecting Learner Autonomy in Tertiary Level English Learning: A Study at Van Lang University. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 3(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.23311>
- Tsulaia, N., & Adamia, Z. (2020). Formative assessment tools for higher education learning environment. 3(1), 86-93.
- Yilmaz, K. (2013). Comparison of quantitative and qualitative research traditions: Epistemological, theoretical, and methodological differences. *European Journal of Education*, 48(2), 311–325. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12014>
- Zein, S., Sukyadi, D., Hamied, F. A., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2020). English language education in Indonesia: A review of research (2011-2019). *Language Teaching*, 53(4), 491–523. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208>