

Writing Assessment by The Seventh-Grade English Teacher in SMPI Al-Abidin of Surakarta

¹Farah Putri Nabilah, ²Teguh Budiharso, ³Zainal 'Arifin, ⁴Muhammad Husin Al Fatah

^{1,2,3,4} Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Mas Said Surakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author e-mail: putrinabilah157@gmail.com

Abstract: *This study aims to investigate the writing assessment techniques employed by seventh-grade English teachers at SMPI Al-Abidin of Surakarta and evaluate how these assessments reflect students' writing abilities. Using a qualitative approach with content analysis, data were gathered from teacher interviews and document analysis of student work. This research adopts the theoretical frameworks of Zhang and Wildemuth, combined with Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis, to systematically examine the teacher's assessment methods and effectiveness. The findings reveal that the teacher predominantly utilizes the Cambridge International mark scheme for writing assessments, ensuring consistent evaluation based on content, organization, language, and communicative achievement criteria. Results show that students generally meet satisfactory performance levels across these criteria, demonstrating proficiency in content clarity, grammatical structure, and coherence. This study contributes to the broader understanding of effective writing assessment practices in secondary education, highlighting the alignment between international assessment standards and local teaching practices to support students' writing development.*

Key Words: Writing, Writing Assessment, Writing at Secondary Level, English Language Teaching, Qualitative Analysis

Introduction

One element of instruction that teachers must grasp is assessment in both classroom and online instruction. Defined as the process of measuring learning through documented evidence (Bkerson, et al., 2020), assessment serves to evaluate how effectively students can apply their subject knowledge to real-world situations. This evaluation process is crucial as it not only measures student achievement but also guides instructional decisions and provides feedback for improvement. For this reason, assessments must be both authentic and relevant to daily life (Cumming & Maxwell, 1999; Dennis, et al., 2013), enabling students to demonstrate their competencies in contexts that mirror real-world applications. As a result, the backward curriculum design approach, assessment takes on a prominent role, positioning teachers more as "assessors" than as "developers" (Solikhah & Budiharso, 2019).

In the context of writing instruction, both teaching and assessment present unique challenges that demand particular attention, as writing is widely regarded as one of the most essential components of academic proficiency (Solikhah, 2015). Teacher development also has become a central focus in teacher preparation and professional growth initiatives worldwide (Solikhah & Budiharso, 2019) as many teachers struggle with confidence in their writing instruction abilities, finding it particularly time-intensive and complex (Sihombing, 2016). The assessment of writing is especially demanding, as teachers must evaluate both students' writing abilities and the specific elements being tested while maintaining consistency and fairness (Brown, 2010). This complexity is further compounded by the multidimensional nature of writing, which encompasses various elements such as spelling, writing speed, capitalization, punctuation, and overall quality (Erford, et al. 2001 in Sihombing, 2016). These multiple components create significant challenges in developing comprehensive and accurate assessment tools.

The importance of L2 writing assessment has grown significantly across all academic disciplines, becoming a critical concern in both educational and vocational settings (Shabani & Panabi, 2020). This increased emphasis reflects the growing recognition of writing



proficiency as a crucial skill for academic success and professional advancement. Students typically demonstrate their writing proficiency by producing texts that raters evaluate using various scoring systems, with holistic and analytic scoring being the most widely accepted approaches (Brown & Abeywickrama 2019, in Shabani & Panabi, 2020). As Weigle (2002) explains, while holistic scoring provides an overall impression of writing quality, analytic scoring evaluates specific writing features separately. Additionally, the trait-based approach assesses performance relative to specific task requirements (Hyland, 2003 in Nodoushan, 2014). Each of these methods offers distinct advantages and limitations, requiring teachers to carefully consider their choice of assessment approach based on their specific educational context and objectives.

These assessment methods have been extensively discussed in both theoretical frameworks and practical applications, providing teachers with a diverse toolkit for evaluating student writing effectively. However, the effectiveness and appropriateness of these techniques can vary significantly depending on the educational context and the specific needs of students (Hasim, 2022). Some researchers have noted that while rubrics provide clear evaluation criteria, they may not fully capture the subtle nuances and creativity in student writing (Reynolds, 2019). This limitation highlights the need for a balanced and comprehensive approach to writing assessment.

Recent research has significantly advanced our understanding of writing assessment in secondary education, particularly in diverse educational contexts. Studies by Lestari (2019) emphasized the critical importance of teacher professional development in implementing innovative assessment methods, highlighting how proper training can enhance assessment accuracy and effectiveness. Building on this foundation, Susanti (2020) demonstrated the effectiveness of rubric-based assessments in Indonesian contexts while acknowledging implementation challenges across diverse student populations. The research revealed both the potential benefits and practical limitations of standardized assessment tools in varied educational settings. Permatasari (2021) further contributed to the field by showing how formative assessment techniques and ongoing feedback sessions in Jakarta's EFL settings led to marked improvements in student writing skills, emphasizing the value of continuous assessment and feedback loops in writing instruction.

Despite these valuable contributions to writing assessment research, particularly in the Indonesian educational context, there remains a significant gap in understanding the specific assessment methods teachers employ to evaluate students' writing skills in practice. The existing literature, while comprehensive in theoretical frameworks, lacks detailed examination of how these assessment techniques are implemented and adapted in specific educational contexts. This study aims to address this gap by examining writing assessment techniques used by teachers at SMPI Al-Abidin, with particular focus on the specification of assessment methods and their effectiveness in capturing students' writing development in real-world educational settings. By investigating these practices in detail, this research seeks to contribute to the broader understanding of effective writing assessment strategies and their practical implementation in secondary education.

In line with the issue mentioned above, this paper addresses two research questions. First, what kinds of writing assessments are used by seventh-grade English teachers at SMPI Al-Abidin in Surakarta? Second, how do these writing assessments reflect the writing abilities of SMPI Al-Abidin students? These questions aim to explore the assessment methods employed and their effectiveness in portraying students' writing skills.

Literature Review

1. Writing

Writing, as elucidated by Brown (2001), encompasses the production of written content through cognitive processes including ideation, drafting, and revision. This process necessitates specialized competencies in idea generation, coherent organization, and the appropriate application of discourse markers and rhetorical conventions within a written context. Nunan (2003) further conceptualizes writing as a cognitive process involving the invention of ideas, the contemplation of their effective expression, and their systematic arrangement into coherent statements and paragraphs. This definition implies that students are expected to engage in conceptual exploration and subsequently transform these concepts into well-structured paragraphs. Gillespie et al. (2013) expand on this understanding, characterizing writing as a recursive activity resulting in a written product. They emphasize that proficient writing demands a broad knowledge base and the capacity to produce comprehensible text. The authors underscore the significance of writing-related knowledge, which serves as a fundamental resource in both the writing process and the resulting product. This diverse knowledge, stored in long-term memory, is actively utilized by writers throughout the composition process.

To become proficient in writing, students need to master several key elements. These essential components are: structure, how sentences and paragraphs are constructed; vocabulary, the words chosen to express ideas; content, the actual information and ideas being communicated; organization, how the ideas are arranged and flow throughout the piece; mechanics, the technical aspects like spelling, punctuation, and formatting. Each component plays a crucial role in creating clear, well-crafted written work (Syarif & Rozimela, 2024; Ampa & Quraisy, 2018).

2. Writing Assessment

Writing assessments play a vital role in educational and professional contexts for several key reasons. They provide an accurate measure of a candidate's ability to communicate effectively in written form, while also offering valuable feedback for improvement. Well-designed assessments ensure validity and reliability, accurately reflecting writing capabilities across different contexts. These evaluations can encompass a diverse range of writing tasks, allowing for a comprehensive assessment of various skills including creativity, structure, and argumentation. The outcomes of such assessments can significantly impact learners' self-perception and motivation, influencing their educational choices and engagement. Moreover, properly conducted writing assessments uphold ethical standards, ensuring fairness and transparency in the evaluation process. This multifaceted approach to writing assessment not only measures current skills but also guides future development, making it a fundamental tool in educational settings for fostering effective written communication abilities (Cambridge Assessment, 2017; Weigle, 2002).

According to Hyland (2003), such an approach takes a variety of forms and falls into three main categories: (a) holistic, (b) analytic, and (c) trait-based. As Weigle (2002) claims, the holistic approach offers a general impression of a piece of writing; the analytic approach is based on separate scales of overall writing features; and the trait-based approach takes a particular task into consideration and judges performance traits relative to its trait requirements (Hyland, 2003). For more clarity, below is the elaboration of the writing assessment approaches:

a. Holistic Scoring

A holistic scale is providing a single, overall score based on the general impression of a piece of writing. They are often used for their efficiency and simplicity, especially in large-scale assessments. This method aims to rate a writer's overall proficiency (a response to the text as a whole). This approach to scoring students' written performances is global and tacitly reflects the idea that writing is a single entity that is best captured by a single scale that integrates the inherent qualities of the writing (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019; Hyland, 2003; Weigle, 2002).

b. Analytic Scoring

Analytic scoring was developed to address the main flaw of holistic scoring: combining all aspects of good writing into a single score. In this approach, raters use a set of specific criteria evaluate writing, with features of good writing categorized separately. Scores are given for each category, providing more detailed information than a single holistic score. This method better defines and sometimes weights individual components, making it more effective at distinguishing weaker texts. Common categories in analytic scoring include content, organization, grammar, and sometimes vocabulary and mechanics, with each category receiving a separate numerical value and provided by detailed feedback (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019; Weigle, 2002). Overall, this approach provides a more comprehensive evaluation of writing quality compared to holistic scoring, as it clearly delineates the various aspects of effective writing (Weigle, 2002; Hyland, 2003).

c. Trait-Based Scoring

Analytic and holistic scoring methods share a common characteristic: they rely on predetermined criteria to evaluate writing quality, assuming that good writing can be universally defined regardless of context. Both approaches apply a priori standards across various writing situations. In contrast, trait-based scoring represents a departure from these traditional methods by embracing a context-sensitive approach (Weigle, 2002). Unlike its predecessors, trait-based scoring doesn't presuppose universal standards of good writing. Instead, it's designed to address the specific topic and genre features of each writing task. This method aims to create unique evaluation criteria tailored to individual prompts and the responses they elicit, making it inherently task-specific. As a result, trait-based scoring offers a more nuanced and contextual assessment of writing quality, recognizing that effective writing may vary depending on the particular requirements and circumstances of each task. (Weigle, 2002; Hyland, 2003).

As Hyland (2003) suggests, trait-based approaches fall into two main categories, they are:

a. Primary-Trait Scoring

Primary-trait scoring is in some way similar to holistic scoring in that in primary trait scoring, too, one score is assigned to the criteria intended for scoring; however, it differs from holistic scoring in that the criteria intended for scoring a piece of writing are sharpened and narrowed to just one feature relevant to the writing task in question (Hyland, 2003). This scoring system defines a primary trait in the writing task which will then be scored. Very often a critical feature of the writing task is considered to be the primary trait, and that feature is what will be scored.

b. Multiple-Trait Scoring

Multiple-trait scoring is very much similar to analytic scoring as Hyland (2003) and Weigle (2002) portrays writing as a complex, multidimensional concept that is inherently tied

to specific contexts and objectives. As a result, the scoring criteria can encompass characteristics that are not typically found in more generalized analytic evaluation systems. This approach recognizes that the qualities of effective writing may vary depending on the particular situation and purpose, allowing for a more nuanced and context-specific assessment than traditional methods provide.

3. Writing at Secondary Level in Indonesia

Writing in secondary school English language classrooms encompasses a range of skills and objectives. At its foundation, it involves mastering grammar and orthography through written exercises, with students learning to construct grammatically correct sentences and use appropriate terminology. However, writing at this level goes beyond mere sentence construction. It requires students to develop more complex skills such as descriptive, narrative, and expository writing. These skills involve describing people and places, narrating events in chronological order, and explaining, comparing, and contrasting ideas. As students progress, they are expected to engage in more sophisticated writing tasks that demand critical thinking, clear organization, and effective expression of ideas (Weigle, 2002; Wren & Marten, 2006).

In the context of Indonesia, where English is taught as a foreign language, secondary school students face unique challenges in developing their writing skills. The Merdeka Belajar curriculum emphasizes the importance of English writing for academic and future success, a sentiment shared by both teachers and students. Creating a positive learning environment is crucial for maintaining student motivation, particularly given the limited exposure to good writing practices and the lack of ongoing assessment methods. To address these challenges, it's essential to use diverse and authentic writing materials that engage students effectively and help them develop metacognitive skills (Faizah, et al., 2024).

Writing at the secondary level prepares students for academic success and real-world communication. It involves producing more complex texts such as essays and reports, which require students to connect sentences into coherent paragraphs and create logically structured sequences of paragraphs. This level of writing allows for some freedom in expressing ideas while adhering to discourse conventions. Students are expected to reflect, analyze, and expand their knowledge through writing, going beyond mere information conveyance. Both timed and untimed writing assignments are typically included, mirroring the types of tasks students will encounter in higher education and professional settings. Ultimately, secondary-level writing aims to develop students' ability to communicate effectively in various contexts, preparing them for future academic and professional challenges (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019; Weigle, 2002).

4. Previous Studies

Zulfa (2021) investigated the adaptation of writing assessments to an online format during the COVID-19 pandemic, highlighting the challenges Indonesian teachers faced in providing detailed feedback and maintaining student engagement in digital environments. Although teachers employed various online tools to facilitate writing exercises, they encountered difficulties with the depth of assessment and interactivity. However, the study did not explore how specific digital tools and strategies could be utilized to enhance assessment depth and interactivity, especially in resource-constrained settings.

The study by Natalia et al. (2018) focused on the effectiveness of authentic assessments, which are real-world tasks that simulate practical contexts to assess students' writing skills. Findings indicated that these assessments boosted student motivation and engagement, offering a more meaningful learning experience compared to traditional testing. Nevertheless, this study

did not address the need for standardized guidelines on integrating authentic assessments into the curriculum or assess how these assessments perform across different levels of writing proficiency.

Rahmawati (2022) examined teachers' perspectives on writing assessments, noting that educators valued assessments that measured both grammatical accuracy and content accuracy. Teachers, however, reported challenges in reconciling standardized testing requirements with formative assessment methods that better support student progress through feedback and active learning. This study left unexplored how teachers could balance the demands of standardized testing with the need for formative feedback, particularly in large classrooms where personalized feedback may be challenging to provide.

Lastly, Dwiyanti and Suwastini (2021) investigated the effects of formative online assessments on students' writing development during remote learning. The results showed that iterative feedback in these assessments allowed students to improve their writing skills over time, though technical and interaction-related challenges hindered the assessments' overall effectiveness. However, the study did not fully examine specific strategies to overcome these technical limitations to maximize feedback efficacy

Method

1. Research Design

This study using qualitative approach which employs interpretive, naturalistic approaches to investigate phenomena in their natural settings, utilizing various methods to collect and analyze data that describe ordinary and troubling moments in people's lives (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Cresswell & Cresswell, 2018). Content analysis, as the research design, allows researchers to draw replicable and valid conclusions from texts or other significant materials by coding and categorizing data to identify patterns, themes, or biases, with the aim of revealing deeper perceptions and insights beyond the surface of the text (Krippendorff, 2004; Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009). Content analysis research design is suitable for this study because it enables the researcher to systematically examine and interpret the teacher's assessment tools, rubrics, feedback, and graded papers, revealing patterns and insights into their assessment practices that are crucial to understanding the topic in depth.

2. Participant of the Study

The participant in this study the seventh-grade English teacher at SMPI Al-Abidin Surakarta. The selected participant's position offers valuable perspectives on the implementation and effectiveness of writing assessment in the context of SMPI Al-Abidin in Surakarta.

3. Data Sources

The documents in this study complement each other strategically: the students' graded writing tasks provide tangible evidence of assessment practices, while the interview transcripts offer insights into the teacher's rationale and decision-making process. This combination allows the researcher to examine both the practical implementation of writing assessment and the pedagogical reasoning behind it, thereby providing a comprehensive understanding of the assessment practices. Through analyzing these complementary documents, the researcher could verify the alignment between the teacher's stated assessment approaches from the interviews and their actual implementation as evidenced in the graded assignments.

4. Data Analysis Technique

After the data are collected, the next step is analyzing the data. In document analysis research design, data analysis involves organizing and preparing the data, conducting an initial reading through the information, and coding the data to identify themes and patterns. This process is iterative and involves both inductive and deductive reasoning. Researchers often use computer programs to assist in managing and analyzing the data. The findings are then represented in various forms such as tables, graphs, or figures, and interpretations are made based on the thematic analysis (Cresswell & Cresswell, 2018).

In this section the researcher combining two techniques in analyzing the data. To support valid and reliable inferences, qualitative content analysis involves a set of systematic and transparent procedures for processing data (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009). According to Braun and Clarke (2006), thematic analysis is highly adaptable, diverse, and compatible with a wide range of methodologies because it is not limited to theory or epistemologies. Thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data. The phases of thematic analysis as described by Braun and Clarke (2006); Zhang and Wildemuth (2009) allow for a systematic way of seeing, as well as processing qualitative information using “coding”. The content analysis process comprised six step: first, all collected data were transformed into written text to establish a uniform format for analysis.

This transformation involved transcribing interview recordings and organizing document notes into analyzable textual data. Second, the researcher identified specific units of analysis that aligned with the research questions, focusing on relevant segments of text that could provide meaningful insights. The third stage involved establishing clear and comprehensive rules for the coding system to ensure consistency throughout the analysis process. In the fourth stage, the researcher methodically coded all identified units of analysis according to the established coding rules, categorizing data into relevant themes and patterns. The fifth stage focused on testing the consistency of coding and themes through multiple reviews and cross-checking, where any inconsistencies led to necessary revisions of the coding system or thematic categorization to maintain analytical rigor. Finally, in the sixth stage, the researcher drew conclusions from the analyzed data, synthesizing the findings to address the research questions and establish final, validated results. This systematic approach ensured a thorough and credible analysis of the qualitative data, maintaining the integrity of the research findings.

Result and Discussion

This research which dealt with writing assessment used by the English teachers at SMPI Al-Abidin in Surakarta contributed some findings that were worth to be presented and discussed in this chapter. The findings are presented based on the research questions have been formulated earlier.

1. The Techniques of Writing Assessment used by English Teachers

The first question proposed in this research is “What kind of writing assessments are used by seventh-grade English teachers in SMPI Al-Abidin of Surakarta?” and the finding shown in the table below.

Table 1. Kind of Writing Assessment

Theme	Sub-theme	Quote
Systematic Assessment Structure	Assesmentent types	1. “Jadi kita ada yang namanya progression test” (N1.T1.St1.P1)
		2. “Nah, di Cambridge sendiri di level 7,8 persiapan check point itu mereka adanya progression test, progression itu jadi ada progress nya setiap level.” (N2.T1.St1.P1)
		3. “Progression test berfungsi untuk mempersiapkan siswa dalam mengikuti ujian akhir dalam kurikulum Cambridge yaitu Checkpoint series.” (N3.T1.St1.P1)
	Assessment framework	4. “kalau disini kan kurikulumnya pakai Cambridge ya.” (N4.T1.St2.P1)
		5. “Oleh karena itu, Al Abidin memutuskan untuk menggunakan kurikulum Cambridge.” (N5.T1.St2.P1)
		6. “Ada scoring nya” (N6.T1.St2.P1)
		7. “Ada mark scheme of writing test ya” (N7.T1.St2.P1)
		8. “Tapi kalau dari ini (penilaian ujian al-abidin) itu dah ada rubrik sendiri” (N8.T1.St2.P1)
		9. “Ya heeh rating scale. Nah nanti misalnya, saya baca dulu terus nanti saya apa saya benerkan satu kalo ada yang salah itu kan baru nanti saya sesuaikan dengan rating scale nya ini berapa. Maksudnya masuk ke kategori 5, kan tadi 5, 4, 3, atau berapa saya sesuaikan gitu.” (N9.T1.St2.P1)

2. Writing Assessment Portray the Ability of Students Writing Skills

The second question proposed in this research is “How do writing assessment portray the ability of writing of SMPI Al-Abidin students? The findings are displayed in the table below.

Table 2. Students' Writing Ability

Theme	Sub-theme	Quote
Multi-layered Evaluation Process	Assessment components	1. “Jadi misalnya di part 1 di question 1 itu yang dinilai ada 3 content, organization, sama language nya” (N9.T2.St1.P1).
		2. “Terus nanti yang di question yang ke-2 beda lagi mbak. Yang ditanyakan content, communicative achievement, organization sama language nya gitu.” (N10.T2.St1.P1).
	Assessment Implementation	3. “karena kan ini ee test yang semester kayak mid-term gitu loh mbak ee setahun tuh dua kali” (N11.T2.St2.P1).
Student Diversity and Adaptability	Students` characteristics – English proficiency	4. “ya menyesuaikan, kan nggk mungkin, kadang misal gini ya mbak. Disini kan standart nya menurut saya itu tinggi kan e Cambridge kan untuk ESL ya English for Second Language kan. Anak-anak kita disini tu memang banyak yang C1 ada yang skornya 500 lebih, ada 600 malah C1. Tapi ada juga yang masih ee basic banget yang bahkan A2 gitu lo kayak yang A2 itu kan nilainya masih 100 ya. Jadi, ee sini tu nggak full bisa ESL gitu kita terapkan . jadi, masih kayak EFL gitu. Jadi, bahas Inggris nya tu masih dipake yang EFL bukan yang ESL gitu” (N12.T3.St1.P1).
		5. “Untuk kemampuan anak anak sendiri ada yang hasil score dari English score mendapatkan C1, B2, dan B1. Tapi mostly rata2 kemampuan anak berada di level B1 (Skor 300-390).” (N13.T3.St1.P1).
		6. “Saya menganalisis berdasarkan partnya. Misal di part content, saya melihat apakah writing Ananda ini menjawab ide pokok yang diinstruksikan dalam soal writing, untuk yg organizationnya saya melihat dari bagaimana penggunaan conjunction, apakah kalimatnya mengandung subjek, objek dan complement, grammarnya menggunakan tenses apakah sudah tepat tenses dan rumus tensesnya. Untuk language, lebih ke diksi dan pemilihan kata menggunakan phrasal verb sudah tepat belum. Sedangkan communicative achievement lebih pada writing anak-

anak apakah mudah dipahami dan alurnya dapat dengan mudah dipahami oleh pembaca.” (N14.T3.St1.P1).

Table 3. Students' Writing Test Score

Student	Part 1				Part 2				
	C	L	O	Total	C	CA	O	L	Total
AAS	5	4	4	13	4	4	4	4	16
SI	5	5	5	15	5	4	5	4	18
N	5	5	5	15	4	4	4	4	16

Notes:

- C: Content
- O: Organisation
- L: Language
- CA: Communicative Achievement

Discussion

This section discusses the findings of the study in relation to existing theories and previous research, focusing on two main aspects:

Techniques of Writing Assessment Used by English Teachers

The findings indicated that the writing assessment practices were thoroughly and systematically aligned with the Cambridge International curriculum framework. This alignment ensures that both the content and structure of assessments are directly informed by the curriculum's learning objectives and performance standards. As a result, the assessment practices reflect a coherent approach to evaluating student writing, designed to meet the internationally benchmarked expectations outlined by Cambridge International. This is evidenced by the teacher's statement:

“kalau disini kan kurikulumnya pakai Cambridge ya.” (N4.T1.St2.P1).

In addition, the primary assessment tool utilized in the evaluation process was the Cambridge Writing Assessment Rubric, which functioned as a standardized measurement instrument. This rubric provided a structured and consistent framework for assessing various dimensions of student writing performance, such as content development, organization, language use, and grammatical accuracy. By employing a standardized rubric, the assessment ensured objectivity and comparability across student cohorts, aligning with the rigorous expectations set by the Cambridge curriculum. This is supported by the teacher's remarks:

“Ada mark scheme of writing test ya” (N7.T1.St2.P1).

Conclusively, the findings revealed that SMPI Al-Abidin implements a systematic writing assessment approach aligned with the Cambridge International curriculum framework. This alignment aligns with Brown's (2019) assertion that assessment should be systematically designed to serve instructional objectives and curriculum standards. The teachers' utilization of Cambridge The implementation of Cambridge Writing Assessment Rubric as the primary assessment tool aligns with Hyland's (2003) perspective on effective writing assessment tools. Hyland emphasizes that writing assessment instruments should be designed to capture multiple dimensions of writing competence while maintaining validity and reliability in measuring specific writing skills. The standardized marking scheme employed by the teachers encompasses multiple dimensions: Content development; Communicative achievement; Language usage; and Organizational structure as the teacher remarks:

“Jadi misalnya di part 1 di question 1 itu yang dinilai ada 3 content, organization, sama language nya” (N9.T2.St1.P1).

This multi-dimensional approach reflects Weigle's (2002) framework for writing assessment, which emphasizes the importance of considering multiple aspects of writing competence rather than focusing on singular elements.

1. Writing Assessment Portrayal of Students' Writing Skills

In response to the findings of the assessment results revealed that students consistently demonstrated commendable performance across all key writing criteria. The results indicated a high level of proficiency in the four fundamental domains of writing assessment, as shown in Table 5.3. Students were able to effectively develop and express their ideas, showing a strong command of content that reflected depth and relevance. In terms of communicative achievement, their writing conveyed clear and appropriate messages to the intended audience, fulfilling the task requirements with precision. Additionally, their use of language was both accurate and varied, showcasing a strong grasp of vocabulary and grammatical structures. Finally, students demonstrated a solid ability to organize their ideas coherently, employing logical sequencing and cohesive devices to ensure clarity and flow within their writing. These findings suggest that the students' writing abilities are well-aligned with the assessment criteria, reflecting both their understanding of the curriculum expectations and their capacity to meet international writing standards.

Fundamentally, the study found that the writing assessment effectively portrayed students' writing capabilities, as evidenced by their performance across assessment criteria. This finding supports Hyland's (2003) perspective that effective writing assessment should provide a comprehensive picture of learners' writing abilities.

The teachers' thorough review and systematic evaluation process aligns with Weigle's (2002) framework for writing assessment reliability and validity. According to Weigle, reliable writing assessment should demonstrate consistent scoring procedures and clear evaluation criteria across different raters and occasions.

The study also found that the teachers employed a methodical approach to assessment, as evidenced in the teacher's statement:

"Saya menganalisis berdasarkan partnya. Misal di part content, saya melihat apakah writing Ananda ini menjawab ide pokok yang diinstruksikan dalam soal writing, untuk yg organizationnya saya melihat dari bagaimana penggunaan conjunction..."
(N14.T3.St1.P1).

This suggests that the assessment techniques not only gauge students' writing abilities but also contribute to a positive learning environment where students feel capable and confident in their writing skills. The satisfactory performance of students indicates that the combination of structured assessment and teacher support may effectively enhance students' writing capabilities.

In summary, the findings from the study support and extend existing theoretical perspectives on curriculum alignment, multidimensional assessment, reliability, and the positive role of assessment in learning. These theoretical implications suggest that well-designed, systematically applied writing assessments can contribute significantly to both the accuracy of student evaluations and the enhancement of student writing skills.

Conclusion

In summary, this study underscores the successful implementation of writing assessment methods consistent with the Cambridge International curriculum framework at SMPI Al-Abidin, Surakarta. Utilizing the Cambridge Writing Assessment Rubric as a foundational tool allows for a structured and multifaceted approach to evaluating student

writing, thoroughly addressing critical areas. Findings indicate that the systematic use of this rubric not only adheres to international educational standards but also provides a detailed and credible representation of students' writing skills. The teacher's reflective and systematic approach to assessment enhances the reliability and validity of the evaluations, contributing to a constructive learning environment that fosters student confidence and supports improvement in writing abilities.

Overall, this study emphasizes the value of curriculum-aligned, multidimensional writing assessments in improving both the precision of evaluations and the progression of students' writing competence. It is important to note that this study was conducted with a single subject (SMPI Al-Abidin in Surakarta). As a result, the findings and conclusions drawn from this research may have limited generalizability. The results are primarily applicable to the specific context of SMPI Al-Abidin and may not be representative of writing assessment practices in other schools or educational institutions. Future research involving a larger and more diverse sample of schools would be beneficial to validate and expand upon these findings.

Referensi

- Ampa, A. T., & Quraisy, H. 2018. Needs analysis of the English writing skill as the base to design the learning materials. In SHS Web of Conferences Vol. 42, p. 00050. EDP Sciences. Retrieved from: https://www.shs-conferences.org/articles/shsconf/pdf/2018/03/shsconf_gctale2018_00050.pdf
- Bkerson, Trottier, T., & Mansfield, M. 2020. An Integral Process in Online Learning. September.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. 2006. Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101. DOI: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/thematic-analysis#:~:text=Braun%20and%20Clarke's%20thematic%20analysis,and%206%20locating%20exemplars.>
- Brown, H. D. 2001. *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* 2 ed.. California: San Francisco State University.
- Brown, H. D. 2010. *Language Assessment: Principal and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. 2019. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. London: Pearson.
- Cambridge Assessment. 2017. *The Cambridge approach to assessment*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/Images/cambridge-approach-to-assessment.pdf>
- Cambridge International Education. 2024. *Our History*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cambridgeinternational.org/about-us/our-history/>
- Cambridge University Press & Assessment. 2024. *Assessing writing performance at level B1*. [PDF]. Retrieved from: <https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/images/231794-cambridge-english-assessing-writing-performance-at-level-b1.pdf>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. 2018. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 5th Edition. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Cumming, J., & Maxwell, G. 1999. Contextualizing authentic assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policies and Practices*, 62, 177-194. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695949992865>
- Dennis, L. R., Rueter, J. A., & Simpson, C. G. 2013. Authentic assessment: Establishing a clear foundation for instructional practices. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 574, 189-195. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2012.681715>
- Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. 2005. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research: 3ed*. Thousand Oak, London & New Delhi: Sage Publication Inc.
- Dwiyanti, K. E., & Suwastini, N. K. A. (2021). Assessment for writing skills in online learning. *Lingua Scientia*, 28(1), 8–19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23887/ls.v28i1.29069>

- Elo S. & Kyngas, H. 2008 " S H. 2008 The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 621, 107–115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- Faizah, A., Cahyono, B. Y., & Ivone, F. M. 2024. A Prototype of Web-based Supplementary Writing Instructional Media for Upper-Secondary Level Learners. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 101, 343-367. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v10i1.3049>
- Gill, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E. et al. 2008. Methods of Data Collection in Qualitative Research: Interviews and Focus Groups. *British Dental Journal*, 2046, 291–295. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/bdj.2008.192>
- Gillespie, A., Olinghouse, N. G., & Graham, S. 2013. Fifth-grade students' knowledge about writing process and writing genres. *The Elementary School Journal*, 1134, 565–588. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669938>
- Hasim, F. 2022. The role of assessment in enhancing students' writing skills in secondary education. *Asian Journal of Education and Learning*, 132, 110-123.
- Hyland, K. 2003. *Second Language Writing*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Krippendorff, K. 2004. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. Sage publications.
- Natalia, D. E., Asib, A., & Kristina, D. (2018). The application of authentic assessment for students' writing skill. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, 7(2), 49–53. <https://doi.org/10.15640/jehd.v7n2a5>
- Nodoushan, M. A. S. 2014. Assessing writing: A review of the main trends. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 12, 116-125.
- Nor, H., & Afifi, N. 2023. Unpacking Writing Assessment Tasks for Junior High School Students: A Comprehensive Analysis. *ELE Reviews: English Language Education Reviews*, 31, 66-83. DOI: <https://ejournal.uinsaid.ac.id/index.php/ele-reviews/index>
- Nunan, D. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. International Edition, McGraw-Hill, Singapore, 88.
- Permatasari, D. 2021. The impact of formative assessment on students' writing proficiency in EFL classrooms: Evidence from Jakarta. *Journal of Educational Assessment*, 283, 179-194.
- Rahmawati, I. (2022). Teachers' perceptions of writing assessment in Indonesian junior high schools. *Journal of Education Research*, 12(3), 115–125.
- Reynolds, B. L. 2019. Rethinking writing assessment in the EFL context: Challenges and innovations. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 46, 100708.
- Shabani, E. A., & Panahi, J. 2020. Examining consistency among different rubrics for assessing writing. *Language Testing in Asia*, 10, 1-25. Retrieved from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40468-020-00111-4>
- Sihombing, R. 2016. Teachers' Problem and Solutions in Assessing Students' Writing in Senior High School Level: Authentic Assessment or Traditional Assessment. In *Sriwijaya University Learning and Education International Conference*, 2,1, 977-992. Retrieved from <http://conference.unsri.ac.id/index.php/sule/article/download/78/67>
- Solikhah, I. (2015). Reading and Writing as Academic Literacy in EAP Program of Indonesian Learners. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 15(2), 325-341. Retrieved from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1121897>
- Solikhah, I., & Budiharso, T. (2019). Investigating the learning outcomes of an INQF-based english language teaching curriculum in Indonesia. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 10(4), 153-175. Retrieved from: https://www.learntechlib.org/p/216556/article_216556.pdf
- Solikhah, I., & Budiharso, T. (2019). Teaching Practice is not Enough for EFL Teachers: Voices from IAIN Surakarta. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 4(2), 247. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v4i2.193>
- Susanti, N. 2020. The role of rubric-based assessment in enhancing EFL students' writing skills. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 94, 213-227.
- Syarif, H., & Rozimela, Y. 2014. Students' ability and Problems In Writing Review Text at Grade XII SMAN 4 Kerinci. *English Language Teaching ELT*, 21. Retrieved from: <https://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/elt/article/view/4603/3643>

- Weigle, S. C. 2002. *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wren, P. C. & Marten. H. 2006. *High School English Grammar and Composition*. New Delhi: S. Chand and Company Limited.
- Zhang, Yan & Wildemuth, Barbara M. 2009. *Qualitative Analysis of Content*. In Barbara M. Wildemuth Ed., *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science*, 318-329. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Zulfa, I. A. (2021). Assessment media for offline and online writing tests at junior high schools during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, 8(1), 100–117. Retrieved from: <https://journal.uinjkt.ac.id/index.php/ijee/article/view/10018>.