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DESIGNING A RUBRIC TO ASSESS VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS’ WRITING

By:
Ingrita Dewi Puspasari
NIM 06202241042

ABSTRACT

This study aims to design an analytical rubric to assess vocational high school students’ writing. It is an effort to overcome writing assessment problems in vocational high schools.

This was a research and development study. It was conducted by modifying and simplifying the model proposed by Jolly and Bolitho in Tomlinson (1998) into the following procedures: conducting a needs analysis, exploring the needs, designing the rubric, implementing the rubric, evaluating the rubric, and finally writing the final draft of the rubric. Questionnaires and interviews were used as the instruments to gather the data in this study. Based on the result of the needs analysis, the researcher designed the rubric by involving a writing expert to investigate construct validity until the rubric was considered appropriate to be implemented. The rubric was implemented in two stages: tryout and implementation. The tryout was conducted by using the rubric which was validated by the writing expert. The rubric was tried out to evaluate students’ writing. Three English teachers were involved in this stage. The evaluation of the rubric after the tryout was conducted to obtain teachers’ or raters’ experience in assessing students’ performance through the rubric. The revision then was made as necessary based on the teachers’ or raters’ suggestions. The revised rubric was then implemented to evaluate students’ writing in the implementation stage. Based on the result of the implementation, the rubric was considered appropriate to evaluate students’ writing. Therefore, it was regarded as the final draft of the rubric.

The findings show that the designed rubric covers eight aspects of writing performance, namely relevance and adequacy of content, compositional organization, cohesion, adequacy of vocabulary for purpose, grammar, mechanical accuracy I (punctuation), mechanical accuracy II (spelling) and mechanical accuracy III (capitalization). Each aspect of writing performance is written in three important properties of rubric, namely (1) criteria, (2) levels of scores, and (3) descriptors. The criteria represent indicators of good performance on a task. Each aspect of writing is graded into five levels of scores ranging from one to five. In addition, each score has its descriptor which describes specifically what performance looks like. The reliability coefficients that measure the consistency of ratings among different raters are also obtained through the Pearson Product Moment correlation using SPSS 13.0 and the results show that the designed rubric has high agreement among raters as the reliability coefficients are all above 0.800.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the background of the study related to the research problem: why an issue of a rubric to assess writing, especially for students of vocational high school, is important to be explored. This chapter consists of six parts, namely (1) background of the problem, (2) identification of the problem, (3) limitation of the problem, (4) formulation of the problem, (5) objective of the research, and (6) significances of the research.

A. Background of the Problem

The education in vocational high schools based on the Standard of Graduate Competence of the vocational high schools noted on the Regulation of Minister of National Education Number 23 Year 2006 Part A on the 23 of May, 2006 aims to improve students’ intelligence, knowledge, personality, good morals and skills to live autonomously and to follow higher education based on their vocational programs. Living autonomously means that the students are expected to be ready in real life needs such as work after they graduate from vocational school. Either living autonomously or having higher education needs language proficiency and communicative competence, particularly English. Therefore, good language learning of English supports the development of students’ language proficiency and communicative competence.

The word ‘proficient’ itself is defined by Hughes (2003:11) as having sufficient command of the language for a particular purpose. In addition, English as one of the compulsory subjects in the vocational high school curriculum aims
not only to make the students are able to pass the exam but also to prepare them to be ready in future works. The achievement of English learning measures not only the students’ ability in speaking, but also their competence in writing. Both speaking and writing are classified into productive skills.

Writing is one of the skills needed in communication. As stated in the Standard of Graduate Competence of the vocational high schools, the graduated students of vocational high schools are expected to be able to communicate both spoken and written effectively and in a good manner, show the skills of reading and writing systematically and aesthetically, and show the skills of listening, reading, writing and speaking both in Bahasa Indonesia and in English. Furthermore, it can be concluded that writing becomes an important subject that should be mastered by the students.

Students are required to have different abilities according to the proficiency levels. The novice level, for instance, demands that the students are able to communicate both interpersonal and transactional in written discourse, formally and informally in conveying request and command in daily life. Almost the same as the novice level, the elementary demands that the students have a competence in relation to occupation, while the intermediate demands that the students have a competence in relation to profession.

Since English is needed in the field of work, having a good competence on it will probably make writing easier for the students to find a job. Writing will, therefore, be a crucial factor to be mastered by the students. It is because they are going to write the requirements of the job first before sitting an interview. The
requirements, then, will be the first examination. Those who have better composition in writing will have larger opportunities to pass the enrolment. Additionally, Weigle (2002) notes that the ability to write well has a very close relationship to academic and professional success.

Assessment should be conducted in order to measure the students’ achievement in writing. Implementing authentic assessment is considered meaningful. It allows the students to assess real-world tasks which provide them opportunity to apply their knowledge and skills. The tasks give chances to the students to practice English according to their fields and needs. The assessment may conduct after the students’ performance as the instruments will be examined are the students’ writing product.

In relation to authentic assessment, assessing students’ writing can be conducted through performance assessment. A performance assessment describes any assessment that involves either examination of behavior in the real-world or simulation of a real-life activity such as a performance of the ability being assessed and the evaluation of the performance by raters. In this case, any writing test that involves actual writing is considered a performance test because the writing product represents the performance of writing.

Assessing students’ work, however, is a personal work of English teachers. Some aspects such as familiarity to the students, family relationship, mood and other factors may bring the teachers into subjective assessment. Furthermore, teachers may have different points of view in assessing students’ work. One teacher may have heavy weight in linguistic structures while another
teacher is interested in the coherence of composition. In order to reduce those personal influences, teachers should use an assessment tool to assess students’ performance in writing in which experts named it rubric. The rubric will help the teachers not to compare students on the given assessment tasks personally but to assess them according to their quality in writing. A rubric has some criteria to measure the students’ comprehension on the tasks. The criteria will help the teacher to focus on the aspect of writing assessment. Therefore, the evaluation will be more objective.

The result of the study on the needs analysis showed that the English teachers in SMK N 5 Yogyakarta actually have some aspects to be considered in assessing writing such as idea, availability of topic sentence, supporting details, vocabulary, cohesion, and grammar. However, those teachers have not applied them in a rubric. It makes the teachers often give different feedback for the same mistakes on students’ writing performances. There are, in fact, no particular rubrics to assess vocational high school students’ writing. The rubric already presented by some experts of writing is general in nature. It is not developed according to the recent curriculum of education in Indonesia. Therefore it cannot be applied directly to assess students’ writing, in particular students of vocational high schools.

With regard to the above issue, the research aims to design a rubric to assess vocational high schools students’ writing. It is expected that by using a reliable rubric, the teachers can easily assess their students’ writing performances which meet the requirements of writing aspects.
B. Identification of the Problem

Vocational high schools have the aim to prepare students for their future professions, to develop students' professional attitudes, to get jobs, to compete with others and to improve their competences. The objective of the English teaching and learning process in vocational high schools is to facilitate students to acquire good communication both in spoken and in written forms when they are involved in business field and industries.

The English teaching and learning in vocational high schools covers four language skills which are also called macro language skills, namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. In addition, teachers should also present micro-language, such as vocabulary, grammar, spelling, and so forth. Hadfield and Hadfield (2008) consider that writing is a difficult skill for many learners than the other skills, even in their mother tongue. Writing is not a natural skill which can be acquired in daily life spontaneously as speaking. It needs to be taught explicitly (Weigle, 2002). Furthermore, writing tends to be more elaborate than speech with more lengthy construction. The students have to know how to put sentences together accurately.

In line with Hadfield and Hadfield (2008), Richards and Renandya (2002) also argue that there is no doubt that writing is the most difficult skill to master. The difficulty lies not only in generating and organizing ideas, but also in translating the ideas into a readable text. The skills involved in writing are highly complex. The students have to pay attention to how to organize ideas and other
aspects such as spelling, punctuation, word choice, and so forth. The difficulty becomes higher if the students' language proficiency is weak.

The graduates of vocational high schools are expected to have capabilities in the intermediate level. However, according the interview with the English teachers in SMK N 5, the students’ English competence, particularly writing, is still in the novice level. The lack of writing expertise is frequently seen as a sign that students do not possess the appropriate thinking and reasoning skills that they need to succeed. It makes the teachers should work harder in order to make the students have good mastery in writing in particular. The English teachers should have control on the students during the process of learning and after the process of learning. Most teachers have good supervision whilst teaching; however some of them may not do the same when they assess the students’ work, especially writing.

In relation to the instrument to assess students’ writing performance, teachers need a rubric as many experts say that a rubric should be implemented to assess writing performances. Brookhart (1999) in Moskal (2000) proposes that scoring rubrics are descriptive scoring schemes that are developed by teachers or other evaluators to guide the analysis of the products or processes of students’ efforts. Scoring rubrics are typically employed when a judgment of quality is required and may be used to evaluate a broad range of subjects and activities. It is a formative type of assessment because it becomes an ongoing part of the whole teaching and learning process. Rubrics are classified into two: analytic rubric and holistic rubric.
An analytical rubric articulates levels for each aspect of assessment so the teachers can assess students' performances on each criterion. On the other hand, a holistic rubric does not list separate levels of performance for each aspect. In order to determine what kind of rubrics will be used in assessing students' writing, the English teachers should know the objective of the assessment.

C. Limitation of the Problem

In reference to the background and identification of the problem above, this study deals with designing a rubric to assess vocational high school students' writing. However, the researcher only designs an analytical one as it provides more detailed information about the students' performance in different aspects of writing and provides a more comprehensive analysis of students' writing performance.

D. Formulation of the Problem

In accordance with the limitation, the problem in this research is formulated as follows:

“What is an analytical scoring rubric that is suitable to assess students’ writing performances in vocational high schools like?”

E. Objective of the Research

This research aims to design an analytical scoring rubric that is suitable to assess students’ writing performances in vocational high schools.
F. Significances of the Research

The researcher expects that this research will give significances both theoretically and practically. Theoretical significance is related to the role of the research study in the development of theory. In this research, it is expected that this study gives beneficial and referential contributions in giving general knowledge of the way to design an analytical rubric to assess vocational high school students' writing.

Moreover, practical significance is the one related to the benefits of the study for other parties. The result of the study can be beneficial to the English teachers of vocational high schools who implement the rubric in assessing students' writing, the students of vocational high schools, and other researchers who are going to do similar research.

The significances of the research for the parties mentioned above are explained as follows.

1. To the English teachers

The research is expected to be one of the resources to assess the writing of vocational high schools students. The teachers can use or modify the rubric according to the assessment needs.

2. To the students of vocational high schools

The research gives benefit to vocational high schools students in which it guides them to be able to write comprehensively. Therefore, their writing is expected to meet the requirements of the aspects of writing.
3. To other researchers

The research can be used by other researchers as the input to conduct similar research. It gives general knowledge of how to design an analytical rubric to assess vocational high schools students’ writing.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW, RELEVANT RESEARCH STUDIES, AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter attempts to contextualize appropriate theories underlying this study. It consists of three major parts, namely (1) literature review, which discusses the issues on writing, assessment, and scoring rubric, (2) relevant research studies, which explore similar researches that have been conducted previously, and (3) conceptual framework, which clarifies the researcher's concept in conducting this study.

A. Literature Review

1. The Nature of Writing

a. Definition of Writing

In the English teaching and learning, writing is one of the four language skills which demands students' practice. Davies and Pearse (2000) state that writing is probably the linguistic skill that is least used by students in their native language. Therefore, Hughes (1989:75) in Weigle (2002:1) argues that the best way to test students' writing ability is to get them to write. It is because a student who is able to speak well does not always mean that he or she is good at writing as well.

Writing as proposed by Brown (2001: 252) is one activity that is conditioned to attend to the sentence as the basic unit of organization. It is an extremely complex cognitive activity in which the writer is required to demonstrate control of a number of variables simultaneously. The writer should
consider the aspects of writing which include cohesion and coherence to control
the composition, grammar, sentence structure, diction, spelling, punctuation and
capitalization.

Writing, according to Brown (2001), is not a natural activity because there
is a process of thinking, drafting, and revising procedures that require particular
skill. He also adds that students learn the basic rules of writing in their native
language, but very few of them learn how to express their thoughts with logical
organization that accomplish an intended purpose. Therefore, to be able to write
something good, students must do a lot of practices. It is done to get them used to
write anything in well-ordered steps.

When students attempt to get ideas, they only need to write them down of
what they have in their mind and then they have to select the most contributive
one. The next step is that they have to put the selected ideas orderly. Making a
draft is necessary in order to help them to make the composition in a good
organization. Finally, checking and revising the composition are considered as the
final step.

Writing as well as speaking is categorized into productive skills. It means
that writing and speaking involve producing language rather than receiving it.
However, both of them are different in nature. Brown (1994) in Weigle (2002),
Brown (2001) and Spratt, Pulverness and Williams (2005) note some
characteristics to distinguish written language from spoken one as presented in
Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Written language</th>
<th>Spoken language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanence</td>
<td>Permanent and often can be read and reread</td>
<td>Transitory and must be processed in real time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written language tends to stay on page and does not disappear</td>
<td>Spoken language tends to disappear as soon as it is spoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production time</td>
<td>Writers generally have more time to plan, review and revise their words before they are finalized</td>
<td>Speakers must plan, formulate, and deliver their utterances within a few moments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Writer and reader are separated by time and space</td>
<td>Speaker and listener usually have face-to-face contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthography</td>
<td>Uses punctuation and capital letters to show sentences</td>
<td>Have richness of information devices (i.e. stress, intonation, pitch, volume, pausing, and so forth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td>More formal</td>
<td>Less formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing has organizations i.e. formality in essay that demands a writer’s consistency to conventions like paragraph topics, logical order i.e. comparing and contrasting something, and also opening and closing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Tends to contain a wider variety of words and lower frequency of words</td>
<td>Tends to contain less varied of words and have higher frequency to repeat the same words, sometimes contain hesitations and interruptions and use simple grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good writers will learn to take advantage of the richness of English vocabulary and use more complex grammar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Has longer clauses and more subordinators</td>
<td>Tends to have shorter clauses connected by coordinate conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writers must learn how to combine sentences, how to make references to other elements in a text, how to create syntactic and lexical variety, and so forth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, Weigle (2002) stated that one of the most important distinctions between writing and speaking is the fact that writing is highly valued in educational settings and the standardization of writing means that accuracy in writing is more important than in speaking. The importance of correctness in writing is particularly relevant for writing in academic context in which writing is frequently seen as a key to entry into academic discourse community (Spack, 1988; Swales 1990 in Weigle, 2002).

In short, writing can be defined as an activity to integrate sentences into a coherent organization. It is not an instant process as there are some steps of writing to create a final product of writing.

b. The Types of Classroom Writing Performances

There are four types of classroom writing performance as proposed by Brown (2004). The types are imitative, intensive or controlled, responsive and extensive. The explanation of each type is presented below.

1) Imitative

Brown (2001) calls the imitative type of writing performance as “writing down” in which students simply write down English letters, words, or sentences in order to learn the rules of orthographic code. Imitative is a type of writing in which students are trying to master the mechanics of writing. Furthermore, Brown (2001) states that “dictation” is one of the models of imitative writing which emphasizes more on correct spelling. In imitative writing, the teacher slowly reads a short paragraph once or twice and then the students writing down the paragraph read by the teacher. Then, the teacher reread the whole paragraph so students can
check their writing. Form becomes the primary focus at this stage, while meaning and context are the secondary one (Brown, 2004).

2) **Intensive (Controlled)**

Intensive writing, according to Brown (2004), may also be thought of form-focused writing, grammar writing, or simply guided writing. Intensive writing emphasizes writing as opposed to real writing in which students produce language to display their competence in grammar, vocabulary, or sentence formation and not necessarily to convey meaning. Brown (2001) provides an example of intensive writing that is asking the students to change all present tense verbs to past tense.

Furthermore, Brown (2004) offers another example of intensive or controlled writing performance, that is, a dicto-comp. Here, the teacher reads a paragraph two or three times at normal speed, then the students are asked to write the paragraph according to what they hear from the teacher. The students must internalize the content of the passage, remember a few phrases and lexical items as key words, and then rewrite the paragraph in their own words.

3) **Responsive**

In responsive writing performance, the students are required to perform at a limited discourse level, such as connecting sentences into a paragraph or creating a logically sequence of paragraphs (Brown, 2004). Here, the students should have a good mastery on grammar and focus on the discourse conventions that will achieve the objective of the written text. This type of writing performance emphasizes context and meaning.
4) Extensive

Extensive writing involves good management in the process of writing. Here, the students focus on achieving a purpose, organizing and developing ideas logically, using supporting details to support main idea, and creating a coherent paragraph (Brown, 2004). The lexical choice also becomes one of several components of the evaluation of extensive writing. Extensive writing involves the rules of effective writing. Therefore, this type of classroom writing performance was implemented in this study. The rules of effective writing are expected to stimulate students' awareness on the aspect of writing in which their awareness will improve their quality of writing.

c. Micro and Macroskills of Writing

When writing is applied in the teaching and learning process, it must have several micro and macroskills that should be achieved by the students. The micro and macroskills are very useful for the teachers to find the appropriate techniques to cover the domain of writing skills.

Brown (2004:221) proposes the micro and macroskills of writing as follows.

1. Produce graphemes and orthographic patterns of English.
2. Produce writing at an efficient rate of speed to suit the purpose.
3. Produce an acceptable core of words and use appropriate word order patterns.
4. Use acceptable grammatical system (e.g. tense, agreement, pluralization), patterns, and rules.
5. Express a particular meaning in different grammatical forms.
6. Use cohesive devices in written discourse.
7. Use the rhetorical forms and conventions of written discourse.
8. Appropriately accomplish the communicative functions of written texts according to form and purpose.
9. Convey links and connections between events and communicate such relations as main idea, supporting idea, new information, given information, generalization, and exemplification.

10. Distinguish between literal and implied meanings when writing.

11. Correctly convey culturally specific references in the context of the written text.

12. Develop and use a battery of writing strategies, such as accurately assessing the audience’s interpretation, using prewriting devices, writing with fluency in the first drafts, using paraphrases and synonyms, soliciting peer and instructor feedback, and using feedback for revising and editing.

Brown (2004) calls points 1-6 as microskills which apply more appropriately to imitative and intensive types of writing performance, while the rest numbers are classified into macroskills which are essential for the successful mastery of responsive and extensive writing.

The designed rubric, actually, attempts to cover the above micro and macroskills. The aspect of relevancy and adequacy of content, for instance, cover points 8 and 10. Meanwhile, point 9 represents the aspect of compositional organization. Point 6, in addition, represents the aspect of cohesion, while the aspect of vocabulary is covered by point 3. Points 4 and 5, moreover, signify grammatical aspect. The aspect of mechanical accuracy of spelling is represented by point 1. The other two aspects, punctuation and capitalization, are not explicitly stated in the micro and microskills. However, the researcher includes both punctuation and capitalization in the designed rubric as she considered that the students have less awareness on those two aspects. Therefore, it is expected that the students’ writing will meet the requirements of micro and macroskills of writing by fulfilling the presented aspects in the designed rubric.
d. Writing in Vocational High School

The Standard of Graduate Competence of the vocational high schools noted on the Ministry Regulation Number 21 Chapter A states that the vocational high schools students should have skills of reading and writing systematically and aesthetically. In addition, Chapter 22 on the same regulation informs that vocational high schools students should perform the ability in scrutinizing, reading, writing and speaking both in *Bahasa Indonesia* and English. From the regulation, it can be concluded that vocational high school students should have a good ability in writing.

The nature of writing in vocational high school is different from that of writing in senior high schools. The Standard of Graduate Competence of vocational high school noted on the Ministry Regulation Number 23 Chapter A states that vocational high school students should have mastery on vocational program in order to fulfill the requirements of future occupation. In relation to writing, the students of vocational high school must have the ability to write according to their vocational program as noted in the syllabus of vocational high school. In this case, the government aims to provide vocational high school students with the specific skill for their future carrier life.

2. Assessment

a. Definition of Assessment

Blaz (2001) defines assessment as any method used to better understand the current knowledge that a student possesses. Assessment serves to monitor students' understanding on a given unit or concept, to give valuable feedback to
students on what progress has been made and what still needs to be improved. Additionally, O’ Malley and Pierce (1996) state that assessment information is needed by administrators, teachers, staff, developers, students and parents to assist in determining appropriate program placement and instructional activities as well as in monitoring students’ progress.

Assessment and evaluation are often used synonymously. However, they are two different processes. Assessment, according to William (2003), involves four processes such as deciding what to measure, selecting or constructing appropriate measurement instruments, administering the instruments, and collecting information. On the other hand, evaluation involves judgements about students’ writing based on the assessing information.

Brown (2004) proposes some advantages of assessment. He points out that periodic assessment, both formal and informal, can increase motivation by serving students’ progress. Students can measure their achievement from the assessment report. Furthermore, assessment can confirm areas of strength and pinpoint areas that need further work. It can also encourage students to set goals for themselves. In addition, assessment can also aid in evaluating teaching effectiveness.

Briefly, it can be inferred that assessment plays an important role in the process of teaching and learning writing. Assessment provides information for the teachers about the strengths and the weaknesses of their teaching as the students’ achievement also represents teachers’ teaching quality. Meanwhile, assessment provides information related to their achievement. It can also motivate them to prepare their best performance in accomplishing assignments or tasks.
b. Types of Assessment

There are some types of assessment. The assessments are categorized based on the techniques, the time of implementation and the references. The explanation of each type is presented below.

1) Assessment based on the Techniques

Based on the techniques, assessment is divided into formal assessment and informal assessment. The following are the explanation of those assessments.

a) Formal Assessment

Brown (2004) proposes the definition of formal assessment. He states that formal assessment is an exercise or a procedure specifically designed to tap into a storehouse of skills and knowledge. Formal assessment is systematic and planned. It aims to give teachers and students an appraisal of students' achievement.

b) Informal Assessment

Informal assessment can take a number of forms such as incidental comment for students' response and participation like "good", "very good", "excellent", "good work" and so forth. A good deal of teachers' informal assessment is embedded in classroom tasks designed to elicit performance without recording results and making fixed judgments about students' competence (Brown, 2004).
2) Assessment based on the Time of Implementation

According to the time of implementation, assessment can be divided into formative assessment and summative assessment.

a) Formative Assessment

Formative assessment, according to Hughes (2003), is an assessment which is used to check the progress of students and to see how far they mastered what they should have learned. Formative assessment is intended to provide feedback to students and instructors for the purpose of the development of teaching and learning. From students’ perspective, formative assessment provides information on their progress and performance. From teachers’ perspective, formative assessment is used as diagnostic instrument to evaluate students’ performance. Generally, the results of formative assessment do not contribute to students’ final grade but are purely for the purpose of assisting students to figure out their strengths and weaknesses in order to prepare future improvement.

b) Summative Assessment

Summative assessment is used to measure or summarize what students have learned (Hughes, 2003). Generally summative assessment occurs at the end of a topic or the end of a course in order to evaluate how well students have acquired the knowledge and skills presented in that section or during the complete course. Burden and Byrd (2010) add that summative assessment also provides a basis for assigning grades. It examines the students’ broad ability as compared to the detailed information of each component in formative assessment.
3) **Assessment based on the References**

According to the references, assessment is divided into norm-referenced which compare students' score and criterion-referenced which measure students' ability according to what they can actually do with the language.

a) **Norm-Referenced Tests**

Hughes (2003) mentions that norm-referenced tests are tests which provide information of a student's score in relation to other students'. Ranking students is the primary issue in this kind of test. Additionally, Brown (2004) states that the purpose of norm-referenced tests is to place test-takers along a mathematical continuum in rank order. Therefore, the students' score is interpreted in relation to a mean (average score), median (middle score), standard deviation (extent of variance in scores), a numerical score such as “230 out of 300” (Brown, 2004) and a percentile rank such as “in the top of 10 per cent of students who taken the tests” or “in the bottom of 5 per cent” (Hughes, 2003). A norm-referenced test finds the student's performance level in relation to levels of others on the same test.

b) **Criterion-Referenced Tests**

Criterion-referenced tests, according to Hughes (2003), are designed to provide information of students' of what students' can actually do in the language. It aims to classify the students according to whether or not they are able to perform some tasks or set of tasks satisfactorily. The tasks are set and the performances are evaluated (Hughes, 2003). It is also clarified by Burden and Byrd (2010) who say that criterion-referenced test is used to interpret the students' performance by comparing it to some specified criterion, such as performance
standard. In contrast to norm-references test, individual mastery becomes the primary issue in this kind of test. The students who perform the tasks and pass the standard are said to be “competent” and those who are not perform and pass the standard are said to be “incompetent”. Brown (2004) cites that criterion-referenced tests are designed to give students feedback, usually in the form of grades, on specific course or lesson objectives. Therefore, the designed scoring rubric in this study provides descriptors for each grade or score which can be used to give feedback to the students.

c. Assessing Writing

Blaz (2001) proposes that the purpose of writing assessment is to communicate a thought or idea in writing and to demonstrate proficiency in the target language. Writing at secondary level is different from primary one. In secondary level, writing focuses on the skills required to write longer texts, i.e. composition in which a performance of students are judged using an agreed judging process.

In the assessment process, the teachers assess the students’ writing by scoring them in particular scale. The writing itself, according to Harmer (2004), involves some processes such as planning, drafting, revising, and editing. Additionally, Weigle (2002) mentions two central considerations in scoring students’ writing: defining the rating scale and ensuring that raters use the scale appropriately and consistently.

It has been mentioned in the previous chapter that conducting authentic assessment through performance assessment is considered meaningful to assess
students’ writing. The discussion of authentic assessment and performance assessment is presented below.

1) **Authentic Assessment**

Authenticity becomes a consideration for teachers when assessing students’ work. Authentic assessment, according to O’Malley and Pierce (1996:4), is a multiple form of assessment that reflects students’ learning achievement, motivation and attitudes on instructionally relevant classroom activities. Additionally, Mueller (2010) states that authentic assessment is a form of assessment in which students are asked to perform real-world tasks that demonstrate meaningful application of essential knowledge and skills. He also states that authentic assessment usually includes a task for students to perform and a rubric by which their performance on the task will be evaluated.

The term authentic assessment is used to describe the multiple forms of assessment that reflect students’ learning, achievement, motivation and attitudes on instructionally classroom-relevant activities (O’Malley and Pierce, 1996). The use of authentic assessment places greater demands on teachers than the use of single-answer tests as it needs time and management to design and to use that assessment. Moreover, judgment is required in reaching conclusions about students’ learning and students’ progress.

Moreover, Blaz (2001:15) proposes the criteria of authentic assessment as follows:

- A variety of assessing techniques are used
- Students are given some choices on the assignment
- A variety of learning modalities (i.e. auditory, visual, kinaesthetic) are assessed
- Students engage in problem-solving, decision making and higher-order thinking skills
- Objectives for the assessment are listed
- Specific criteria for the assessment are given to students (i.e. length, format, resource to use and due dates), called a *product descriptor*.
- The assessment, if long, is divided into smaller parts, with separate descriptions and due dates for each
- Specific criteria for evaluating the assessment are given to students before beginning the project, with examples of what to do or not to do, called a *rubric*
- Students are encouraged to plan how they will approach the task, monitor their progress, and evaluate their thinking (reflection and metacognition used)
- Feedback is prompt, positive in nature, and specific
- Students have a chance to share their work with others (work may be displayed)

Blaz (2001) adds information on product descriptor and rubric. Then, she also defines product descriptor as a clearly fined task whether rubric is a list of explicit criteria for assessing students’ performance or product.

O’Malley and Pierce (1996) consider performance assessment to be a subset of authentic assessment. However, not all authentic assessments are performance-based. Reading and listening, for instance, have many authentic manifestations, but since they are not directly observable, they are not performance-based (Brown, 2004).

2) **Performance Assessment**

Performance assessment consists of any form of assessment in which students construct a response orally or in writing (Feuer and Fulton, 1993; Heeman, Aschbacher, and Winters, 1992 in O’Malley, 1996). It encourages the students to demonstrate specific skills and competencies, that is, to apply the skills and knowledge they have mastered (Stiggins, 1987 in Mueller, 2010).
Performance assessment requires students to accomplish complex and significant tasks and bring them to bear prior knowledge, recent learning, and relevant skills to solve realistic or authentic problems (Herman, Aschbacher, and Winters, 1992 in O’Malley, 1996).

Performance assessment includes three aspects as proposed by Burden and Byrd (2010), namely direction which outlines the nature of the products that students will develop, the products itself which students prepare, and a rating scale to assess students’ products. Performance assessment also requires teachers’ judgment of students’ responses. When the students produce or conduct the performance, the teachers need a scoring scale to translate the students’ performance into some type of score. To aid in making the judgments accurate and reliable, a scoring scale referred to as a rubric is used, in which numerical values are associated with performance levels. The criteria for each performance level must be precisely defined in terms of what the students actually do to demonstrate skill or proficiency at that level (O’Malley, 1996).

Furthermore, performance assessment offers criteria which have greater degree than those represented by the usual paper and pencil test, one of the kinds of traditional assessment. Fitzpatrick and Morrison (1971) in McNamara (1996) state that performance assessment can cover processes (such as in speaking assessment) and products (such as in writing assessment). Then, they conclude that the term “performance assessment” is shorthand for “performance and product evaluation".
Figure I explains the characteristics of performance assessment which can be compared with traditional fixed response assessment in Figure II (McNamara, 1996).

**Figure I: Characteristics of Performance Assessment**

In the performance assessment, students do the performance according to the task noted in the instrument. The raters then judge or rate the performance by means of a rating scale which finally result a score. On the other hand, in the traditional fixed response assessment, the score is derived directly from the instrument in which each item offers the candidate a number of options or choices, however only one of options or choices is correct.
Additionally, Blaz (2001) and Mueller (2010) also distinguish the characteristics of traditional assessment and performance assessment. The distinctions are presented in Table 2. Blaz (2001) also cites some reasons why use performance assessment such as clarity, confidence, high expectations, and students' engagement. Clarity means transparency about the aspects to be assessed. When students know exactly what is expected, they are more likely to be able to accomplish it. Furthermore, students' understanding on the aspects of assessment will lead their confidence. A well-written scoring procedure which defines the criteria of excellent product is considered meaningful to motivate students to produce writing that meets the criteria. Finally, it is expected that students are motivated when they have performance assessment which highly authentic.
Table 2: The Characteristics Differences between Traditional Assessment and Performance Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Characteristics of Traditional Assessment</th>
<th>The characteristics of Performance Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selecting a response</td>
<td>Performing a task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrived</td>
<td>Real-life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to grade/machine-scored</td>
<td>Rubric-scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall / recognition</td>
<td>Contextualized, authentic application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facts, memorized data and procedures</td>
<td>Metacognitive, complex behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-level thinking skills</td>
<td>Reasoning, problem solving, collaborative effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering options provided (students passive)</td>
<td>Individualized response (students active)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by text or teacher-constructed</td>
<td>Students involvement in setting goals and criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards determined/discovered after test to assure confidentiality</td>
<td>Published standards known in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single score or grade</td>
<td>Evaluation on multiple competencies possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect evidence</td>
<td>Direct evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Scoring Procedures for Writing Performances

The scoring procedures are important because the score is used to make decisions and inferences toward students’ achievement. Defining the type of rubric is the first decision in determining a final score whether a single score will be given to each script or will each script be scored according to several aspects of writing.

a) Definition of Rubric

Stevens and Levi (2005:3) cite that a rubric is a scoring tool that lays out the specific expectations for an assignment. It is the most commonly used method for scoring, evaluating, and grading a performance assessment (Blaz, 2001). A
Scoring rubrics are typically employed when a judgment of quality is required and may be used to evaluate a broad range of subjects and activities. A rubric divides an assignment into its component parts and provides a detailed description of what constitutes acceptable or unacceptable levels of performance for each of those parts.

There are some common features of a rubric which should be considered by the evaluator before creating rubric. The common features, as proposed by Picket and Dodge (2001), are (1) focus on measuring a stated objective (performance, behavior, or quality), (2) use a range to rate performance, and (3) contain specific performance characteristics arranged in levels indicating the degree to which a standard has been met. Additionally, they also explain stages in creating a rubric (1) reflecting on the task and context, (2) listing our learning objectives and expectations, (3) grouping and labeling the objective and criteria, and (4) application to a rubric grid format.

Moreover, Blaz (2001) explains the characteristics of rubric that a rubric should clear, democratic, involving, and engaging. The term 'clear' represents that a rubric will clearly define what excellent, good, or poor work is. Students will clearly see the exact expectation and desired outcome of the assessment. Furthermore, the word 'democratic' explains that a rubric should have a consistent
A guideline which can be understood by both students and teachers. The word ‘involving’ means that students should always be involved in creating the rubric, as well as self or peer assessment. Finally, the term ‘engaging’ explains that a rubric will encourage students to evaluate their own work and strive for excellence.

A rubric has some advantages as proposed by Picket and Dodge (2001). First, a rubric improves students’ performances by clearly showing the students how their work will be evaluated and what is expected. It also promotes students’ awareness about the criteria to use in assessing their performance. Furthermore, it allows the assessment to be more objective and consistent, for instance the different evaluators give the similar score for the same composition or the same evaluator gives the same score on different occasions. A rubric also helps teachers by providing informative feedback to students regarding their strengths and weaknesses in their performance. The teachers can employ a rubric to analyze the effectiveness of the instruction. Moreover, it accommodates heterogeneous classes by offering a range of quality levels. Finally, a rubric is easy to use and easy to interpret.

In addition, a rubric will also help the teachers to assess students’ work more objectively. The assessment should not be contaminated by students’ effort, tardiness, misbehavior and other extraneous factors. If these factors are permitted to become part of the assessment then the meaning of assessment will be lost (Gronlund, 1998 in Brown, 2004).
Many experts believe that a rubric will improve students' end products and therefore increase learning. There are two kinds of rubrics in language assessment: a holistic rubric and an analytic rubric. The evaluator needs to determine what kind of rubric will be used to assess students' writing.

b) Kinds of Rubric

(1) Holistic Rubric

Weigle (2002) proposes that a holistic scoring is the assigning of a single score based on an overall impression of the writing. In this type of assessment, the students' writing are read quickly and then judged based on the rating scale mentioned in rubric. Each point in a holistic rubric is given a systematic set of descriptors and then the rater matches an overall impression of students' work with the descriptors to arrive at a score. A holistic rubric is usually used to measure a particular aspect in writing.

Implementing a holistic rubric in assessing students' writing has some benefits. It takes short time of assessment as it is faster to read a script once and gives a single score than to read it several times in which each time focus on different aspects of writing. Moreover, White (1984) in Weigle (2002) argues that a holistic rubric reflects more closely the authentic and personal reaction of a reader to a text. The score of holistic rubric tends to emphasize the students' strengths on their writing performances (Cohen, 1994 in Brown, 2004).

On the other hand, a holistic rubric also has some weaknesses. It does not provide useful diagnostic information about students' writing ability as a single score does not allow raters to distinguish between various aspects of writing.
(Weigle, 2002). In addition, he (2002) argues that a holistic rubric is not always easy to interpret as raters do not necessarily use the same criteria to arrive at the same score. For classroom instructional purposes, a holistic rubric provides very little information of students’ achievement. An example of a holistic rubric is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: **Holistic Rubric for a Writing Assessment (Blaz, 2001:28)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The response does not complete the assignment. Information may be missing or inaccurate accuracy and logic. There are problems with accuracy and logic. Overall impression: incomplete and unsatisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard barely met. Information provided is generally accurate. There may or may not be a conclusion or an opinion. If one or the other is offered, there may be problems with accuracy and logic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meets standard. Information is accurate. A logical conclusion or an opinion is offered. Writing is fluent but not interesting. The answer is lengthy rather than concise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exceeds standard. Information is accurate and writing is fluent and lively. Answer is concise and to the point. Conclusions and / or opinions are logical. Overall impression: complete and satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) **Analytic Rubric**

Methods of scoring which require a separate score for each of a number of aspects of a task are said to be analytic (Hughes, 2003). It separates the features of a composition into components in which each component is scored separately (O’Malley and Pierce, 1996). Therefore, an analytic rubric provides more detailed information about the students’ performance in different aspects of writing.

The researcher provides an example of analytical rubric proposed by Weir (1990) in Weigle (2002) in Table 4. She chooses Weir’s (1990) model as it was adapted to design the analytical rubric in her study.
Table 4: An analytical scoring proposed by Weir (1990) in Weigle (2002: 117)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Relevance and adequacy of content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The answer bears almost no relation to the task set. Totally inadequate answer</td>
<td>Answer of limited relevance to the task set. Possibly major gaps in treatment of topic and/or pointless repetition.</td>
<td>For the most part answers the task set, though there may be some gaps or redundant information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Compositional Organization</strong></td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>No apparent organization of content</td>
<td>Very little organization of content. Underlying structure not sufficiently controlled</td>
<td>Some organizational skills in evidence, but not adequately controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Cohesion</strong></td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>Cohesion almost totally absent. Writing so fragmentary that comprehension of the intended communication is virtually impossible.</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory cohesion may cause difficulty in comprehension of most of the intended communication</td>
<td>For the most part satisfactory cohesion although occasional deficiencies may mean that certain parts of the communication are not always effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</strong></td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>Vocabulary inadequate even for the most basic parts of the intended communication</td>
<td>Frequent inadequacies in vocabulary for the task. Perhaps frequent lexical inappropriacies and/or repetition</td>
<td>Some inadequacies in vocabulary for the task. Perhaps some lexical inappropriacies and/or circumlocution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Grammar</strong></td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>Almost all grammatical patterns inaccurate</td>
<td>Frequent grammatical inaccuracies</td>
<td>Some grammatical inaccuracies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some experts propose several advantages of an analytic rubric. Francis (1977) and Adams (1981) in Weigle (2002), for instance, cite that an analytical scoring is more useful in rater training because inexperienced raters can more easily understand and apply the criteria in separate scales than in a holistic scoring. Moreover, Perkins (1983) in O’Malley and Pierce (1996) adds two advantages of an analytical rubric. First, it gives teachers diagnostic information for planning instruction. Another one, it provides feedback to students on specific aspects in their writing. Hughes (2003) adds that a number of assessment aspects of assessments will tend to make the scoring more reliable and call raters’ attention to areas needed improvement. Classroom evaluation of learning is best served through analytic scoring as the aspects of assessment enable the students to measure their achievement themselves (Brown, 2004).

However, an analytic rubric also has disadvantages. Weigle (2002) and Hughes (2003) state that an analytic scoring takes longer time than holistic scoring since raters are required to make more than one decision for every script.
Furthermore, the concentration on the different aspects of assessment may disturb raters’ attention from the overall effect of the writing.

c) A Comparison of Holistic and Analytic Rubrics

Weigle (2002) compares holistic rubrics and analytic rubrics on six aspects such as reliability, construct validity, practicality, impact, authenticity, and interactiveness. Weigle (2002) defines reliability as consistency of measurement across different characteristics or facets of a testing situation such as different prompts and different raters. Meanwhile, construct validity refers to the meaningfulness and appropriateness of interpretations on the basis of test scores (Bachman and Palmer, 1996:21). Practicality, additionally, is defined as the relationship between the resources that are required for test development and administration and the resources that are available for these activities (Weigle, 2002). Moreover, impact can be defined as the effect that tests have on individuals (particularly students and teachers) and on larger systems, from a particular educational system to the society at large. As Bachman and Palmer (1996) note that using test score have consequences that must be considered carefully in making decisions regarding the administration and use of tests.

Weigle (2002) summarizes briefly the comparison of holistic and analytic scales on six qualities of test usefulness as shown in Table 5. Additionally, Bachman and Palmer (1996:23) also define authenticity as the degree of correspondence of the characteristics of a given language test task to the features of a target language task. It means that a writing task should be representative to the students’ need beyond the test. Interactiveness, as defined by Bachman and
Palmer (1996), relates to the interaction between the test takers or students and the test. It is the extent and type of involvement of a student’s characteristics in accomplishing a test task (Weigle, 2002). The interaction of the test takers or students and the test may be influenced by the rating scale if the test takers know how their writing will be evaluated.

Table 5: A Comparison of Holistic and Analytic Scales on Six Qualities of Test Usefulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Holistic scale</th>
<th>Analytic Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Lower than analytic but still acceptable</td>
<td>Higher than holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct validity</td>
<td>Holistic scale assumes that all relevant aspects of writing ability develop at the same rate and can thus be captures in a single score: Holistic scores correlate with superficial aspects as length and handwriting</td>
<td>Analytic scales more appropriate for L2 writers as different aspects of writing ability develop at different rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>Relatively fast and easy</td>
<td>Time-consuming; expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Single score may ask an uneven writing profile and may be misleading for placement</td>
<td>More scales provide useful diagnostic information for placement and/or instruction; more useful for rater training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>White (1995) argues that reading holistically is a more natural process than reading analytically</td>
<td>Raters may read holistically and adjust analytic scores to match holistic impression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interactiveness n/a n/a


d) Designing the Scoring Rubric

Determining the kind of rubric which is going to use to assess students’ writing becomes the first step. Then, designing the rubric which represents the
aspects of assessment as explicit as possible is the next step. Besides, the designed rubric should usable and interpretable to avoid ambiguity. Weigle (2002) proposes some factors to consider in designing a scoring rubric as follows:

(1) Who is going to use the scoring rubric?

Alderson (1991) in Weigle (2002) notes three users of rubric in which each of them has different purposes. Constructor-oriented scales aim to guide test developer to construct a task that includes levels to accomplish by the test takers. Assessor-oriented scales intend to guide the scoring process by comparing the script with the descriptors of assessment aspects. User-oriented scales focus on helping students to interpret their test score or achievement.

In this study, the designed rubric would be implemented by the English teachers to assess students' writing performance. Therefore, assessor-oriented scales were suitable.

(2) What aspect(s) of writing are most important and how will they be divided up?

The researcher placed communicative effectiveness first and then followed by language features in the aspects of assessment. It is expected that students can write a cohesive composition that is also correct in grammar and mechanics.

(3) How many points, or scoring levels, will be used?

The researcher determined the aspects and the scale of score in the rubric. She pointed out eight aspects of writing assessment with five-scale levels of score
for each aspect. The raters examined students' work in each aspect and then determine the score according to the quality of students' work.

(4) How will scores be reported?

There are two ways of scoring if raters implement an analytical rubric. The score of each aspect of assessment can be combined for a total score. On the other hand, it can also be reported separately based on the score for each aspect.

Combining score tends to be more reliable and useful for decision making (Weigle, 2002). However, Weigle (2002) mentions that the combined score cannot provide distinct information about students' ability on specific aspects of assessment since the same score can be achieved by students with varying profiles (for instance, good score in compositional organization but low score in grammar, or vice versa). On the other hand, reporting the score separately provides more accurate view of students' ability in writing. However, it is hard for raters to interpret the score quickly for a decision making.

In this study, the researcher reported both the combined score and the separated one. The combined score can be used to judge whether the students were competent or not according to the minimum passing criteria (KKM). Then, the separated scores were useful for diagnostic purposes.

e) Components of the Rubric

(1) Criteria

Criteria are indicators of good performance of a task which are used to assess students' writing performance. Each aspect of writing has different criteria.
The criteria represent the quality of the performance that students should carry out.

(2) Levels

Levels in a rubric are used as direction or point to measure in what level the quality of students' performance. There are some ways to describe the levels of mastery. Some experts use descriptive scales such as "poor", "adequate", "good", and "expert". However, numerical scales such as 1-2-3-4-5 can also be applied. Both descriptive scales and numerical scales aim to describe the students' performance from none to complete mastery.

There is no set formula for the number of levels a rubric scale should have. Most experts prefer to clearly describe the performance in three or even five levels in a rubric. However, Blaz (2001) argues that five levels are enough as the more levels are considered difficult to differentiate and to articulate precisely the quality of students' work.

(3) Descriptors

Descriptors explain the achievement for each level of performance in each aspect of assessment. The descriptors will make the teachers easier in grading students' work as each level has different descriptor for achievement. In writing the descriptors, according to Blaz (2001), the standard such as "excellent" or "expert" should be written first as it becomes the expected level to be achieved by students. However, defining scale points with unambiguous descriptions is important. Therefore, the researcher should describe how the "excellent", "good", "average" or other descriptions of achievement in the descriptor look like. The
clear definitions are expected to limit raters' tendencies to subconsciously bias scores and to enhance reliability of judgment.

f) Aspects of Writing Performance

Writing involves several subskills. Some of the subskills are related to accuracy, for instance, using the correct form of language such as choosing the appropriate vocabulary, using grammar correctly, spelling correctly, punctuating correctly, and forming letters correctly. However, writing is not only related to accuracy. Writing aims to convey a message as well. To do this, the writers need to have enough ideas, organize them well, and express them appropriately. To communicate effectively, some aspects of appropriateness are needed. Those aspects are the relevancy and adequacy of content which shows the relationship between the main idea and supporting details, coherence which forms sequence ideas, and cohesion which provides unity in a composition.

In this study, the researcher involved eight aspects of writing performance which are related to appropriateness and accuracy such as (1) relevancy and adequacy of content, (2) compositional organization, (3) cohesion, (4) adequacy of vocabulary for purpose, (5) grammar, (6) punctuation, (7) spelling, and (8) capitalization. Points 1 to 3 are related to appropriateness while the rest numbers are parts of accuracy.

(1) Relevance and Adequacy of Content

A composition consists of a sequence of paragraphs. Each paragraph has a main idea and supporting sentences which ideally should support each other. The relevant supporting sentences make the composition in a paragraph easy to
comprehend. In addition, paragraphs in the composition should also relevant in order to make a cohesive composition. The composition should in line with its topic so that the concluding inference represents the meaning of the composition.

(2) Compositional Organization

Coherent writing makes a composition is easy to comprehend as the readers can follow the sequence of ideas and points (Brown, 2001). Coherence provides an internal logic in the written text so that the readers can figure out the writers’ thought. Furthermore, Harmer (2004) mentions two advantages of coherence. First, it makes the readers can understand the writers’ purpose whether it aims to give information, suggest a course of action, or express an opinion. A coherent text will not disguise the writers’ purpose (Harmer, 2004). Second, coherence makes the readers can understand the writers’ line of thought.

(3) Cohesion

Cohesion provides unity in a composition. Brown (2001) states that cohesion is a technical matter as various linguistic ways are used to connect ideas across phrases and sentences. In line with Brown (2001), Biber et al. (1999:42) in Harmer (2001) call cohesion as “chains of reference” because language features such as pronouns, lexical repetition and synonym are used to refer to ideas that have already expressed. Various cohesive devices showing additional such as “also” and “moreover”, showing contrast such as “although”, “however”, and “still”, showing cause and effect such as “therefore” and “so”, and showing time such as “then” and “afterwards” can also be used to build cohesion in a composition.
(4) Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

Davies and Pierse (2000) cite that vocabulary is important for communication. The lack of vocabulary often makes students cannot communicate effectively as words become the means to deliver their ideas. David Wilkins as cited by Thornbury (2002) states without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed. Wilkins's statement in Thornbury (2002) aims to show us the importance of vocabulary. Vocabulary is related to words in which at the most basic level, knowing a word involves knowing its form and its meaning (Thornbury, 2002). In order to develop a meaningful composition, the students should have careful consideration in choosing the words in writing a composition.

(5) Grammar

Brown (2001:362) points out that grammar is the system of rules governing the conventional arrangement and relationship of words in a sentence. However, he adds that technically, grammar refers to sentence-level rules only, and not to rules governing the relationship among sentences. In addition, written language, according to Davies and Pierse (2000), is usually more grammatically complete than spoken one as written language does not have tone of voice, facial expression, gestures, or real situational contexts to help readers figure out the intent of the composition. Therefore, written language requires more grammatically complete and often longer sentences that rarely occur in speech.

Diane Larsen-Freeman (1991) in Brown (2001) points out that grammar is one of the three dimensions of language that are interconnected which tells us how
to construct a sentence (word order, verb and noun systems, modifiers, phrases, clauses and so forth). Written grammar is also different from spoken grammar. Thornbury (2005:21) explains the differences as presented in Table 6.

### Table 6: The Differences between Written Grammar and Spoken Grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Grammar</th>
<th>Spoken Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence is the basic unit of construction</td>
<td>Clause is the basic unit of construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses are often embedded (subordination)</td>
<td>Clauses are usually added (coordination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject+verb+object construction</td>
<td>Head+body+tail construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported speech favoured</td>
<td>Direct speech favoured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision favoured</td>
<td>Vagueness tolerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little ellipsis</td>
<td>A lot of ellipsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No question tags</td>
<td>Many question tags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No performance effects</td>
<td>Performance effects, including: Hesitations, repeats, false starts, incompletion, syntactic blends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) Mechanical Accuracy

(a) Punctuation

Harmer (2004) states that the ability to use punctuation correctly is an important skill as the quality of writing is judged not only on the content but also the use punctuation. If capital letters, commas, full stops, sentence and paragraph boundaries are not correctly used, this can not only make a negative impression but also make a composition is difficult to understand. Urquhart and McLevver (2005) argue that punctuation will help readers to understand the composition and help the writers, in this case, the students, to keep on the track of what they have written and what are going to write.
(b) Spelling

Harmer (2004) proposes that spelling makes English relatively easy to read. However, English spelling is presumed difficult for some students. One of the reasons that English spelling is difficult to students is the correspondence between the sound of a word and the way it is spelt which is not always obvious because not all varieties of English spell the same words in the same way. A single sound may have many different spellings, and the same spelling may have many different sounds. Although incorrect spelling does not often affect the understanding of a written message in a composition, it can adversely affect the readers' judgment (Harmer, 2001). Therefore, the ability to write spelling correctly is important. When students see and reflect their mistakes in spelling, their spelling consciousness is raised (Porte, 1995 in Harmer, 2001).

(c) Capitalization

Capitalization in writing is important in order to emphasize words or to show their importance. There are some rules of capitalization in writing that should be considered carefully by the students such as the first word in a sentence which should be capitalized, proper nouns, title of things, direct quotation and so forth.

The researcher considers that capitalization needs to be involved as part in the designed rubric in this study as capitalization is part of the mechanics of writing. However, some students have lack control or comprehension of capitalization. Below is the example of the students' comprehension in relation to capitalization.
Last holiday, my family and I spent one night at the countryside.

(Students’ Writing Performance, see Appendix K)

The student made mistake in that sentence as he did not capitalize the word “I”. Meanwhile, the single-letter words “I” is always capitalized. It is expected that the student will write the sentence as follows.

Last holiday, my family and I spent one night at the countryside.

Another example of student’s composition in relation to capitalization is shown below.

Commuters in Piyungan usually worked in field as a farmer.

(Students’ Writing Performance, see Appendix K)

It is expected that the students writes the sentence as follows:

Commuters in Piyungan usually worked in field as a farmer.

The letter “C” in the word “Commuters” should be capitalized as it is the first letter of the first word in the first sentence. In addition, the word “Piyungan” shows a name of place, therefore the letter “P” should be capitalized.

Therefore, it is expected that the criteria and the descriptor of capitalization in the designed rubric increase students’ awareness of capital letters.

B. Relevant Research Studies

Designing a rubric is not a new issue in the field of teaching and learning. Some experts have designed rubrics which can be used to assess students’ performances. Tucker (2009), for instance, designed a rubric for university students. Generally, rubrics are designed to help teachers to assess and evaluate
students' work. However, Tucker (2009) found in her class that the rubric also increased students' performances.

She designed her rubric by drawing four columns vertically to delineate exactly what was acceptable and was not. She also involved some aspects to consider in assessing writing such as the use of connector and vocabulary. She informed the students how they will be assessed before asking them to perform. Therefore, they could prepare their best performance such as making sure that each part was written according to the rubric. Tucker (2009), then, concluded that the rubric provides a more detailed guide to what is expected. It seemed that a rubric was like scaffolding which helped students to produce high quality work.

However, there are some differences related to techniques of writing the rubric. The researcher wrote the rubric in eight aspects of writing and consulted it with the writing expert by administering an open-ended questionnaire as the form of evaluation. When the rubric was field tested, she involved some assessors to implement her designed rubric to assess students' writing. Therefore, she could measure the reliability coefficient among raters. Tucker (2009), on the other hand, designed a rubric according to her students' needs and implemented the rubric by herself. Therefore, there was no inter-rater reliability. She used a check list to evaluate her rubric and did not involve a writing expert in her research.

Another expert is Bresciani et al. (2009) who designed a rubric to evaluate the quality of research project. Bresciani et al. examined existing rubrics first before they develop their own. They developed the rubric in five different ranked levels (number 1 to 5), according to the worst to the best performance. The
researcher, additionally, also did the same as Bresciani et al. (2009) by involving 5 levels of score in her designed rubric. However, she placed score 5 first as it represented the expected performance did by the students. Then, it followed by scores 4, 3, 2 and 1 with a descriptor for each score. Bresciani et al. (2009) also involved inter-rater reliability as the designed rubric was used by some assessors.

Based on the usefulness of rubric, the researcher believes that the designed rubric will be helpful to assess students’ writing performances. It is expected that through a rubric, the aspects of writing can be assessed in detail.

C. Conceptual Framework

Based on the literature review described previously, a conceptual framework related to rubric and writing assessment is constructed. This conceptual framework is aimed at focusing this research study on the problem concerned.

English has four language skills, namely listening, reading, speaking and writing. Writing is categorized into a productive skill. It is regarded as the difficult skill as writing is not a skill that developed naturally. Hence, in order to have a good ability in writing, the students need to practice. The students of vocational high schools, particularly, are expected to be able to write based on their vocational program in their proficiency level. The students’ ability in writing needs to be measured in order to know their achievement. Therefore, there should be an assessment.

In relation to assessing writing, the teachers need a rubric to help them to grade students’ writing performance. A rubric provides particular criteria as the
guidance for the teachers to assess students' work. A rubric will help teachers to keep on track the aspects being assessed. It will protect the assessment from some factors of subjectivity which may interfere.

However, based on the result of the needs analysis conducted by the researcher, the English teachers in SMK N 5 Yogyakarta did not use a rubric as a means of writing assessment. The English teachers involve some aspects of writing assessment to consider, but they are not explicitly stated in a particular rubric as there is no particular scoring rubric for writing of vocational high schools. It often makes the teachers give different feedbacks to the same mistakes of students' writing.

Based on the interview with the English teachers in SMK 5 Yogyakarta, the teachers emphasize more on the content of students' writing. However, writing is not simply a matter of content. Other aspects such as word choices, grammar, cohesion, coherence, and mechanics also need to be considered. The existing problem, then, leads the researcher to design a rubric to assess vocational high school students' writing.

Based on the theories in the previous section, an analytical rubric considered fits vocational high school students' needs as it provides more detailed information about students' performance. Therefore, the researcher designs an analytical rubric with eight aspects of writing performance to consider in which each aspect has five-levels of scores and each score has its descriptor. It is expected that by using a rubric, the students' writing performances can be assessed thoroughly.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter presents the research methods and procedures that will provide empirical answers to the research problems by presenting the relevant methods and procedures used by the researcher in conducting her study. It deals with (1) the description about type of the research, (2) research design, (3) research procedure, (4) research respondents, (5) setting of the research, (6) instrument of the research, (7) data collection technique, (8) data analysis technique, and (9) validity and reliability of the research.

A. Type of Research

This research is categorized into Research and Development (R and D) as the objective of the research is to develop a product that can be used in educational setting. The product is, then, systematically field tested, evaluated, and revised until they meet specified criteria of effectiveness, quality or standards (Gall, Gall, and Borg, 2003). The product of this research is an analytical rubric which is used to assess vocational high school students’ writing performances.

B. Research Design

Educational Research and Development, according to Borg and Gall (1983), is a process used to develop and validate educational product. The steps of the process in R and D are usually referred to as the Research and Development cycle, which consists of studying research findings pertinent to the product to be developed, developing the product based on these findings, field testing it in the setting where it will be used eventually, and revising it to correct the deficiencies
found in the field-testing stage (Borg and Gall, 1983). This cycle was repeated until the field test data indicate that the product meets the defined objective.

There are some different models of Research and Development. This research uses the model proposed by Jolly and Bolitho in Tomlinson (1998). The model is shown in Figure III.

![Figure III: Research and Development model proposed by Jolly and Bolitho in Tomlinson (1998)](image)

Although the model proposed by Jolly and Bolitho in Tomlinson (1998) is generally used to develop learning materials, it can also be used for many purposes as in this study. The researcher modified and simplified the process of the research in the model into the following procedures: conducting a needs analysis, exploring the needs, designing the rubric, implementing the rubric, evaluating the rubric, and finally writing the final draft of the rubric. The researcher changed the labels in the adapted procedures so that they were different from the original model. It aimed to make the procedures relevant to her study.
Conducting the needs analysis belongs to the first step in the Jolly and Bolitho model. It was also the first step in this modified procedure. However, the researcher combined Steps 2 and 3 in the model into one step. Then, she designed the rubric in which in the model belongs to Step 5. Furthermore, the rubric is implemented to evaluate students' writing. The evaluation used to revise the rubric was done by having some feedback from the teachers or raters who implemented the rubric.

C. Research Procedure

1. Conducting a Needs Analysis

The researcher conducted the analysis of the students' needs by administering questionnaires to the English teachers. The questionnaires contain some questions about the nature of English teaching and learning in vocational high school, English skills, tasks of English skills, the assessment process of English skills, especially writing which currently applied, and the criteria or aspects considered in assessing students' writing. The organization of the questionnaire is shown in Table 7. The result of the needs analysis, then, was used as the input in designing a rubric to assess vocational high schools students' writing performances.

Table 7: The Organization of the Questionnaire of Needs Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes of Question</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Question Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To find some personal information of the English teachers</td>
<td>a. Name of the teachers</td>
<td>Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Classes being taught</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Educational background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
To find some information of how English is taught in vocational high school

d. Teaching experience
e. Teaching training or seminar

| To find some information of how English is taught in vocational high school | Description of how English is taught in vocational high school | Part II 1 |
| To find some information of how the English skills are taught in vocational high school and the differences of time allocation for each skill | Listening  
Speaking  
Reading  
Writing | Part II 2,5 |
| To find some information of writing tasks in vocational high school | Kinds of writing tasks | Part II 3 |
| To find some information of the assessment technique of writing | Writing assessment techniques | Part II 4 |
| To find some information of the students' ability in writing | Description of students' ability in writing | Part II 6 |
| To find some information about the criteria to assess students' writing performances | Aspects of writing to consider | Part II 7,8 |
| To find some information about the explicitness of the performance assessment to the students | Information about the criteria of the assessment told to the students | Part II 9 |

2. Exploring the Needs and Finding Appropriate Theories

Step 2 in this modified procedure involved the second and the third steps in Jolly and Bolitho model. Step 2 in Jolly and Bolitho model states that the exploration of need should be done after the needs analysis was accomplished. Then, it was followed by contextual realization in the next step. However, the researcher combined those two steps into one to explore the needs and find the appropriate theories.
3. Designing the Rubric

The researcher did not conduct Step 4 which deals with pedagogical realization of materials as she did not develop learning materials. The researcher developed the rubric which belongs to Step 5 in Jolly and Bolitho model after she explored the information getting from the questionnaire in the needs analysis. She identified the students' needs and further found the appropriate theories that support her in designing the rubric. In designing the rubric, the researcher adapted the aspects of writing suggested by Weir (1990) in Weigle (2002). He proposed seven aspects such as relevance and adequacy of content, compositional organization, cohesion, adequacy of vocabulary for purpose, grammar, mechanical accuracy I (punctuation), and mechanical accuracy II (spelling). The researcher, however, modified Weir's model by adding one more aspect of mechanical accuracy, that is capitalization.

Each aspect had a criterion of writing performance. The researcher decided to adapt the aspects proposed by Weir (1990) in Weigle (2002) with some modification because those criteria met the complete requirements of writing assessment. Furthermore, the aspects were graded into five levels of score. The scores ranged from one to five in which one was the lowest score and five was the highest. Each score had its own description so that the teacher could determine the students' score of writing performances easily.

After the rubric was designed, the researcher conducted evaluation. The evaluation itself involved a writing expert. The expert gave judgment to the designed rubric. The judgment was conducted to investigate the content validity,
the concept and the theories underlying the designed rubric to assess vocational high school students’ writing. The researcher made some revision toward the rubric until it met the standard of writing evaluation. The researcher gave the expert freedom to conduct evaluation and he suggested using an open-ended questionnaire as it was considered deeper than the close one.

4. Implementing the Analytical Rubric (Field Test)

Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) mentions the term “field test” which refers to the stage of testing the product. The implementation in this stage covered the two last steps in Jolly and Bolitho model in which the teachers applied the rubric by trying it out to assess students’ writing performances. However, the researcher discussed the rubric with the English teachers to explain and to have agreement toward its content first.

The evaluation of this research was done after implementing the rubric. The researcher used an open-ended questionnaire and interview to conduct evaluation. The evaluation aimed to find some essential information related to the designed rubric which was used to assess students’ writing performances and some solutions which were needed to write the revision.

After conducting evaluation, the researcher revised the rubric. She revised the parts of the rubric which were considered inappropriate or ineffective. After that, the revised rubric was implemented in the implementation stage. The rubric used in the implementation stage was the final draft of rubric. The teachers agreed with the content of rubric and there were no alterations. Both the tryout and the
implementation involved three English teachers of vocational high school. Figure IV shows briefly the steps of the research procedure.

Figure IV: Research Procedure
D. Research Respondents

The respondents of this study were three English teachers of SMK N 5 Yogyakarta. The researcher was also involved in getting the data of writing assessment in which she and the English teachers were assessing the students' writing performances. The rubric was tried out and implemented in Grade X. The research involved two classes of Grade X i.e. X DKV B and X Animasi. X DKV B was involved in the tryout. Meanwhile, X Animasi was involved in the implementation stage of the research.

E. Setting of the Research

This research was conducted in SMK N 5 Yogyakarta from January 14th to April 15th 2011. SMK N 5 Yogyakarta is an Arts and Crafts vocational high school which is located at Kenari 71 Street, Yogyakarta. There are some arts and crafts department in that school such as Woodcraft Department, Leather Craft Department, Metal Craft Department, Ceramics Craft Department, Textile Department, Animation Department and Visual Communication Design (DKV) Department. Each department consists of one to three classes with 30 students in average in each class. The complete research schedule can be seen in Appendix N.

F. Instruments of the Research

Instruments are needed for collecting the data. Questionnaires and interviews were used as the instrument to gather the data in this study. The questionnaires were given in two separated times. The first questionnaire was distributed in order to gain the information about the English teaching and
learning, particularly those related to writing assessment. The second questionnaire was given for obtaining the English teachers' opinion about the designed rubric which was used in the tryout stage. Both of the questionnaires were in the form of open-ended questionnaires.

The interviews were conducted to support the data on the questionnaires, especially after the tryout and implementation. In the tryout stage, the interviews were conducted after the English teachers involved in the research fulfilled the questionnaires. The purpose of the interviews was to clarify the teachers' answer in the questionnaires which was considered incomplete. However, the questionnaires did not administer in the evaluation of implementation stage because there was no significant changes in the rubric. Therefore, the evaluation could be covered by conducting interviews. Both the questionnaires and the interviews gathered the teachers' experience in implementing the rubric to assess students' writing performances.

G. Data Collection Techniques

The data in this study were collected in two separated times. First, the data of the students' needs in learning English were collected at the early stage of the study. Secondly, the data about the teachers' evaluation and the students' score analysis on tryout and implementation were collected after the tryout and implementation conducted. The data of the teachers' evaluation were gathered by giving the second questionnaires and interviewing the teachers. The data, then, were used as the input for the revision of the rubric. Meanwhile, the data of the students' score were used to see the reliability coefficient among raters.
H. Data Analysis Techniques

The collected data on the Research and Development were qualitative in nature. However, there were some quantitative data to support the qualitative one. The qualitative data such as field notes, interview transcripts and evaluation from the writing expert and the English teachers involved in the research which were in the form of open-ended questionnaires were analyzed based on the qualitative data analysis as proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994).

The qualitative data such as interview transcripts and field notes were analyzed in four steps. The first step was collecting all the data. Then, it was followed by data reduction in which the data were selected, focused, simplified, abstracted and transformed by summarizing or paraphrasing the interview transcripts and field notes. Data reduction is a form of analysis that sharpens, sorts, focuses, discards, and organizes data in such a way that "final" conclusions can be drawn and verified. It is supported by Tesch (1990) in Miles and Huberman (1994) who states that data reduction can also be seen as data condensation. The next step was data display. The data that had been reduced were then organized and compressed. The data display of this research was in the form of text: field notes and interview transcripts. Finally, the last step was making conclusion drawing and verification.

Meanwhile, the students' writing performances were scored by using the designed analytical rubric. The results of the students' performances were analyzed by statistical data analysis, i.e. the Pearson Product Moment Correlation
technique to find the reliability coefficients among raters. Meanwhile, the mean and the standard deviation were analyzed by using descriptive statistic.

I. Validity and Reliability of the Research

The rubric which is used to assess students' writing performances should have criteria of validity. Validity is an important key to effective research because it establishes the judgment whether or not the ability can indeed be measured. It refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness, correctness, and usefulness of the inferences that a researcher made. Fraenkel and Wallen (2008) mention that validity is the most important idea to consider when preparing or selecting an instrument for use. Furthermore, they also define validation as the process of collecting and analyzing evidence to support such inferences.

The validity employed in designing this rubric was content validity. Glenn and Davidson (2007) define content validity as any attempt to show that the content of the product is a representative sample from the domain that is to be tested. Content validity is determined by systematically conducting a set of operations such as defining in precise terms the specific content universe to be sampled, specifying objectives, and describing how the content universe will be sampled to develop the product. In order to judge whether or not the designed rubric has content validity, a specification of the skills or structures that it is meant to cover is needed. The judgment of content validity should be made by people who are familiar with language teaching and testing but who are not directly concerned with the production of the rubric.
In order to fulfill the content validity, the researcher involved a writing expert to give judgment to the designed rubric. After the researcher finished writing the first draft of the analytical rubric, she consulted it with the writing expert. It was intended to measure whether or not the rubric contained aspects needed to assess students' writing performances. The revision was conducted when there were some parts in the designed rubric which considered inappropriate or ineffective. In addition, the revision was done according to the writing expert's suggestion.

After that, the rubric was tried out in the writing assessment to get the empirical data of the assessment. Here, the researcher conducted evaluation by investigating the English teachers' experiences in using the rubric to assess students' writing. The collected data were then used as the input to write final draft of rubric based on the field test which further was also used to assess students' writing performance in the implementation stage.

In relation to reliability, the researcher involved inter-rater reliability to calculate the reliability coefficient among raters in assessing students' writing by using rubric. Inter-rater reliability refers to the tendency of different raters to give the same scores to the same scripts. Weigle (2002) points out that inter-rater reliability is the consistency of ratings among different raters. It is important to ensure consistency and fairness in the assessment. Additionally, Weigle (2002) also argues that inter-rater reliability is valid when there is an agreement between raters. In line with Weigle (2002), Hughes (2003) proposes that the more similar the scores would have been, the more reliable the test is said to be. If the scoring
of a test is not reliable, then the test result cannot be reliable either. Moreover, Hughes (2003) states that all scripts should be scored by at least two independent scorers in which each scorer should not know how the other has scored a test paper.

Brown (2004) argues that rater reliability is particularly hard to achieve in test of writing skills as writing proficiency involves numerous traits that are difficult to define. However, the careful specification of an analytical scoring can increase rater reliability. Hughes (2003) cites that it is possible to quantify the reliability of a test in the form of a reliability coefficient. He also proposes that the ideal reliability coefficient is 1. A test with a reliability coefficient 1 is the one which would give precisely the same results. On the other hand, a test which has a reliability coefficient 0 indicates a complete absence of a relationship or there is no reliability at all. Two set of scores was the minimum requirement for comparison. Suharto (2006:82) proposes the range of reliability coefficient from 0 to 1 as presented in Table 8.

Table 8: The Range of Reliability Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability coefficient</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.800-1.00</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.600-0.799</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.400-0.599</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.200-0.399</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000-0.199</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter presents the research findings which consist of the result of the needs analysis, the process of designing the rubric, and the field tests of the rubric. The data found in the needs analysis were employed as the preliminary data of this study and were utilized in planning the next stage of the study. This section also describes the process of designing an analytical rubric which was used in the preliminary field test, and the field test itself which involved tryout and implementation of the rubric. The findings of the research are described, analyzed and also discussed.

A. The Result of the Needs Analysis

The first step in this study was conducting the needs analysis. The needs analysis was considered important as it provided inputs for the researcher to design the rubric. The researcher administered questionnaires of the needs analysis to the three English teachers in order to get the information related to the writing assessment. The questionnaires consist of two parts. The first part aimed to know the teachers’ personal information and the second one aimed to gain the information related to the assessment. The questionnaires were in the form of open-ended form to give freedom to answer based on teachers’ view. The form of the questionnaire of the needs analysis was included in Appendix A and its result was provided in Appendix B. The needs analysis was conducted on 9th to 21st August 2010.
The result of the needs analysis showed that the English teachers in SMK N 5 Yogyakarta had some aspects of writing to be considered in the assessment. However, those aspects were not explicitly stated in a particular rubric. Additionally, writing as a productive skill was taught the latest after the students' got input from the other English skills. Furthermore, the teachers added that the students' comprehension in writing was in the novice level. Their weaknesses laid in grammar and vocabulary mastery. They also pointed out that implementing rubric would make the assessment easier as each student had different ability which also needed different feedback. Then, the teachers suggested the researcher some aspects to consider in her rubric such as vocabulary, grammar and idea.

After the researcher conducted the needs analysis, she tried to design the rubric based on the result of needs analysis. Then, she consulted the designed rubric to the writing expert until it met the criteria of writing assessment.

B. Designing the Rubric

After the needs analysis had been done, the researcher started to write the rubric. She used the result of the needs analysis and the relevant theory of writing assessment as the guideline. The researcher involved eight aspects of writing assessment, namely relevancy and adequacy of content, compositional organization, cohesion, adequacy of vocabulary for purpose, grammar, and mechanics. However, she separated the aspect of mechanics into three, namely punctuation, spelling and capitalization as she considered that the students had different comprehension on each aspect of mechanic. Those writing aspects were adapted from Weir's model (1990) as cited in Weigle (2002). Each aspect of
writing was written in different sheet. It aimed to make the rubric clearer. Table 9 presents the model of the rubric.

Table 9: The Model of the Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria: ..........................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the model above, the writing aspect was fulfilled by the aspect of writing i.e. relevancy and adequacy of content. It was followed by the criteria that were the indicator of good performance or the standard of achievement. Additionally, the table consisted of two rows and five columns. The rows were score and descriptor. The scores were organized from five to one and followed by the description of achievement in the descriptor column.

During the process of designing the rubric for the preliminary field test, the researcher needed to revise it four times until the rubric was considered appropriate to be field tested. The first designed rubric was called the first draft of the rubric. Then, it was consulted with the writing expert and was revised according to the expert’s review and suggestion. The revised rubric, then, was called the second draft and so forth.
1. The First Draft of the Rubric

The first draft of the rubric was the one which was developed by the researcher according to the result of the needs analysis and that was according to the appropriate theory. The first draft of the rubric was provided in Appendix E. After the first draft was finished, the researcher consulted it with the writing expert and got some reviews and suggestions.

The writing expert reviewed the aspects of relevancy and adequacy of content, compositional organization, cohesion, grammar, and mechanics in the first validation. Meanwhile, the aspect of adequacy of vocabulary for purpose did not get any suggestion on this occasion. The writing expert might not see the weaknesses of this aspect in this first validation.

a) Relevancy and Adequacy of Content

In the first draft, the researcher used the term “communicative” to refer to a composition that was easy to understand by the readers. However, the writing experts told the researcher that in order to determine whether a composition was easy to comprehend, it was necessary to conduct a comprehension test. The researcher also used adjective indicators of appraisal such as “very good”, “good” “enough” as the indicator of achievement. The writing expert, then, argued that the aspect of relevancy and adequacy of content has multiple interpretation as the teachers or raters might have different point of view regarding those terms. Therefore, he asked the researcher to define how those terms looked like. Table 10 shows briefly the result of the first rubric validation of relevancy and adequacy of content.
Table 10: The Result of the First Rubric Validation of Relevancy and Adequacy of Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maksudnya komunikatif yang bagaimana?</td>
<td>Perlu diperjelas lagi deskripsi &quot;sangat baik&quot;, &quot;baik&quot;, &quot;cukup&quot; dalam sebuah komposisi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(What does communicative look like?)

Untuk mengetahui apakah sebuah komposisi mudah dipahami oleh pembaca atau tidak, maka perlu dilakukan tes pemahaman.

(To determine whether a composition is easy to comprehend, it is necessary to conduct a comprehension test).

b) Compositional Organization

The researcher described that compositional organization was related to the arrangement of the ideas in a composition. She thought that a good composition was the one which had good and well organized ideas. Then, she used the aspects of composing and organizing ideas as the main points in the descriptors. Table 11 shows the expert’s review on the aspect of compositional organization.

Table 11: The Result of the First Rubric Validation of Compositional Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Bagaimanakah penataan ide yang baik dan runtut itu?</td>
<td>- Perlu dijelaskan bagaimanakah penataan ide yang baik dan runtut.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(How does a good and well organized idea look like?)

(It needs to be clarified how a good and well organized idea is).
However, the writing expert argued that those terms needed to be given more details. She needed to explain how good and well organized ideas looked like. Therefore, the English teachers or the raters had the same rules to determine whether or not the students’ works were good and well organized.

c) Cohesion

The term cohesion represented a united composition. It discussed about the ideas of the composition which should relate each other. Table 12 provides the expert’s review of cohesion.

Table 12: The Result of the First Rubric Validation of Cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bagaimanakah komposisi yang padu dan erat itu?</td>
<td>Perlu ada patokan tentang &quot;kepaduan&quot; dalam komposisi. Misal: dengan menggunakan frasa, kata ganti atau kata penghubung seperti therefore, moreover yang tepat. (How does a coherent and cohesive composition look like?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows that the writing expert argued that the descriptors for each score in the aspect of cohesion were not easy to figure out as there were no rules or criteria of how a cohesive composition was. Therefore, he suggested the researcher should provide rules of cohesion i.e. by adding information that a cohesive composition should use pronouns and conjunctions.
d) Grammar

The researcher noted in the criteria of grammatical aspect that the students should be able to use basic grammatical and complex grammatical correctly. Basic grammatical involves the students' ability to write phrases, simple and compound sentences. Meanwhile, complex grammatical involves students' ability to write complex sentences. She considered that the students should have good comprehension on both basic and complex grammatical.

Table 13 shows the result of the expert's review on grammar. The expert agreed with the researcher's model of rubric in the aspect of grammar. Therefore, there was no suggestion to revise the designed rubric in this aspect.

Table 13: The Result of the First Rubric Validation of Grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Sudah cukup mudah dipahami.</em> (It is quite easy to comprehend).</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Mechanical Accuracy I (Punctuation)

The researcher involved punctuation in the aspect of mechanic as she considered that punctuation was an important element in a composition. It became one of the elements of measurement to determine the quality of writing. Punctuation also established the meaning of the composition as it provided the intonation of the composition. Therefore, it made the readers were easy to figure out the intent of the composition. The correct punctuation would also not bring the readers into confusion to differentiate whether the sentences in the composition were questions, imperative, or declarative sentences.
In the first designed rubric, the researcher used adverb of frequency such as never, rarely, sometimes, and often in the descriptors to describe the level of score in the aspect of mechanical accuracy I (punctuation). However, the writing expert argued, as provided in Table 14, that the raters could not predict the punctuation used by the students in their composition. Therefore, the use of frequency aspect might bring the raters to give different score for the same mistakes in this aspect as there were no clear rules of how the frequency looked like. In addition, each student might use different punctuation in developing their composition. Then, the writing expert suggested that the researcher should provide a rule which made the students developed a composition that allowed the punctuation to appear.

Table 14: The Result of the First Rubric Validation of Mechanical Accuracy I (Punctuation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Kita tidak tahu tanda baca yang mungkin dipakai siswa dalam komposisinya.</em></td>
<td><em>Jika ada rambu-rambu tanda baca dalam rubrik, maka siswa diarahkan untuk mengembangkan komposisi yang memungkinkan munculnya tanda baca tersebut.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(We (the raters) do not know the punctuation that the students may use in their composition).

(If there are punctuation rules in the rubric, the students can be directed to develop a composition that allows the punctuation to appear).

f) Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)

Similar to the aspect of mechanical accuracy I (punctuation), this aspect also used adverb of frequency such as rarely, very often, and sometimes to define each score in the descriptors. The writing expert argued that the raters might find
difficulties in assessing students’ writing as there was no guidance of how many mistakes for each frequency were.

Table 15 shows the writing expert’s review on the aspect of mechanical accuracy II (spelling).

Table 15: The Result of the First Rubric Validation of Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Bagaimana membedakan “jarang”, “kadang-kadang”, dan “sering sekali”?</td>
<td>Memberikan rambu-rambu atau pembatas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(How are the criteria such as “rarely”, “sometimes” and “very often” distinguished?)</td>
<td>Misal: “sering sekali” bisa diberikan dengan rambu-rambu “kesalahan lebih dari setengah bagian dari total komposisi”, antara “sekian” sampai “sekian” sebagai pembatas. (Provide rules For instance: “very often” can be characterized by “the mistakes are more than a half of composition” between “such” to ”such” as the limit).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Kata “disampaikan” dalam frasa ‘masih dapat disampaikan...’ dan ‘kurang dapat disampaikan...’ kurang tepat. (The word “delivered” in the phrase “well delivered” and ”not quite well delivered” is less appropriate).</td>
<td>- Kata “disampaikan” diganti dengan “dipahami” karena siswa merasa benar ketika menulis. (The word &quot;delivered&quot; is replaced with &quot;comprehended&quot; because the students think that their composition is correct).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Score 5 dan 1 memiliki criteria agak berbeda. (Score 5 and 1 have slightly different criteria).</td>
<td>- Bahasa kriteria atau deskriptor disamakan dengan dengan skor lain (Make the criteria or descriptors that are equal with other scores).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 15, it can be seen that the expert recommended that the researcher provided rules in order to make the frequency clearer. He suggested the researcher to provide the limit of mistakes for each level of score.

In addition, the writing expert also reviewed the descriptors of score 4 and score 3. The descriptor of score 4 of mechanical accuracy II (spelling) is presented below.

Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan jarang membuat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata
Misalnya: hanya terdapat sedikit sekali kesalahan dalam penulisan kata, akan tetapi maksud dari kata tersebut masih dapat disampaikan dengan baik
(The student develops a composition by rarely making mistakes in spelling. For instance: there are very few mistakes in spelling, however the intent of the words is well delivered)

(see Appendix E)

Additionally, the descriptor of score 3 can be seen as follows.

Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata
Misalnya: terdapat beberapa kesalahan dalam penulisan kata, sehingga maksud dari kata tersebut kurang dapat disampaikan dengan baik
(The student develops a composition by sometimes making mistakes in spelling. For instance: there are some mistakes in spelling, therefore the intent of the words is not easy to deliver)

(see Appendix E)

From the description above, the writing expert argued that the word disampaikan (delivered) in the phrase .... dapat disampaikan dengan baik (well delivered) and
.... kurang dapat disampaikan dengan baik (not quite well delivered) were less appropriate. In relation to spelling, he said that the word disampaikan (delivered) represented that the students wrote the spelling of the words correctly. In fact, the students still made mistakes in spelling the words. Therefore, the expert suggested to change the word disampaikan (delivered) into dipahami (comprehended). It was because when the students wrote the composition, they thought that their spelling was correct and they did not realize the mistakes. It means that the students actually understood the words they used in their composition. However, they found difficulties in the words spelling.

Furthermore, the researcher was also inconsistent in describing the levels of score. Score 5 and 1 had different descriptors from the other levels. In score 5 and 1 the researcher emphasized that pronunciation was a factor that influences spelling. On the other hand, she did not do the same for scores 4, 3, and 2. Thus, the writing expert suggested that the researcher should describe the scores equally so that the raters had the same point of view in assessing students’ work. He also mentioned that the additional explanation of pronunciation which affected spelling can be explained in the analysis.

g) Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)

The researcher involved the aspect of capitalization in designing the rubric as she considered that it actually was an important aspect which most the students did not pay high attention to. The students or even the English teachers thought that capitalization did not impede the meaning of composition, so the students’
ability to deliver idea became the most important aspect in writing. It could be seen from the teacher’s statement as follows.

R : ... *Kalau menurut ibu, capitalization itu penting tidak bu untuk writing? ...*  
(Do you think that capitalization is important for writing?)

T1 : *Yah kalau menurut saya sih mbak, capitalization itu kan ngga merubah makna ya, jadi kalau misal dia salah tapi kan mahnanya dalam komposisi itu kan ngga berubah jadi kalau menurut saya ngga terlalu masalah sih. Tapi karena itu merupakan bagian dari EYD ya jadinya penting. harus ada. ...*  
(In my opinion, capitalization, whether it is incorrect, does not change the meaning of composition. However it should be presented as it is part of EYD). ...

(Interview Transcript 1, see Appendix D)

In fact, writing is not only a matter of evolving idea. However, writing is developing the idea cohesively with correct grammar, appropriate choice of words, and mechanics. Table 16 provides the writing expert’s review on the aspect of capitalization.

Similar to mechanical accuracy II (spelling), the researcher used adverb of frequency to describe students’ achievement in the aspect of capitalization. However, the writing expert argued that the frequency needed to be clarified, for instance, if the students made the same mistakes several times, it was counted as one mistake or some mistakes. The writing expert, then, suggested that the mistakes were better counted according to its quantity, whether it was the same mistake or not.

The researcher also distinguished the use of capital letter in the beginning of sentences and in other parts of sentences which needed to be capitalized.
However, the writing expert argued that the distinction was not necessary as the use of capital letter both in the beginning of sentences and in other parts of sentences had the same importance.

Table 16: The Result of the First Rubric Validation of Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Jika seorang siswa beberapa kali menuliskan nama atau kata seperti &quot;John&quot; yang seharusnya dituliskan huruf kapital tetapi dituliskan dengan huruf kecil, apakah dianggap sebagai satu kesalahan atau beberapa kesalahan sesuai dengan frekuensi munculnya?</em></td>
<td>- Dibuat persetujuan bahwa kesalahan penggunaan huruf kapital dihitung berdasarkan munculnya bukan jenisnya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(If a student does not capitalize the names or words such as “John” several times in which it should be capitalized, according to its frequency, is it considered as a mistake or some mistakes?)</td>
<td>(Make an agreement that the inappropriate use of a capital letter is based on its frequency not its kind).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Penggunaan huruf kapital baik di awal kalimat maupun selain di awal kalimat seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital adalah sama.</em></td>
<td>- Kesalahan tidak perlu dibedakan antara kesalahan di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, tetapi kesalahan dihitung dari kata atau frasa yang seharusnya kapital tetapi tidak dituliskan dengan huruf kapital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The use of capital letters is the same either in the beginning of the sentences or in other parts of sentences such as in the name of place, the name of person, the name of institution, the name of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized).</td>
<td>(It does not need to distinguish the mistakes in the beginning sentences and in other parts of sentences because the mistakes are based on the words or phrases that should be capitalized but they are not written in capital letters).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The Second Draft of the Rubric

Based on the writing expert's review on the second designed rubric, the researcher did some revision. There were four aspects which had been reviewed by the expert, namely relevancy and adequacy of content, compositional organization, cohesion, and grammar. Meanwhile, the rest aspects were considered appropriate at this time. The second draft of the rubric can be seen in Appendix F.

a) Relevancy and Adequacy of Content

In the first validation, the writing expert suggested the researcher to define how the indicator of achievement such as “very good”, "good", and "enough" looked like. Then, the researcher defined those terms in the second draft of the rubric by adding some criteria of achievement such as content mastery, ambiguity, and supporting sentences in the descriptors in order to describe students' quality of writing. However, she did not write those terms explicitly. Besides that, she also provided the limit of expressions to be used in the composition in each level of score. It aimed to make the raters easier in distinguishing the scores.

In the second draft, the researcher omitted the word “very good”, "good", and “enough” in the rubric as there were no exact parameters of how those terms looked like. The researcher, however, described those adjective indicators of achievement in other words. As stated before, she added some criteria of achievement. Content mastery, for instance, aimed to describe students' understanding of the composition, whether or not they developed the composition in line with the topic; whether their composition was easy to figure out or
contained ambiguity; and whether they supported the idea in the composition by the relevant supporting sentences. Table 17 shows the writing expert’s review of the second draft rubric in the aspect of relevancy and adequacy of content. Additionally, the differences between the first draft and the second draft of rubric in the aspect of relevancy and adequacy of content are presented in Table 18.

**Table 17: The Result of the Second Rubric Validation of Relevancy and Adequacy of Content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Ambigu” dan “Penguasaan materi”.</td>
<td>Diperjelas lagi batas-batas antara ambigu dan penguasaan materi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➔ Bagaimana jika komposisi menunjukkan penguasaan materi tetapi ambigu atau jika komposisi tidak menunjukkan penguasaan materi tetapi tidak ambigu</td>
<td>Ambigu berhubungan dengan ketrampilan menyampaikan, jadi kurang bisa dikaitkan dengan penguasaan materi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(“Ambiguity” and ”Material mastery”. ➔ How if the composition shows material mastery but it is ambiguous or if the composition does not show material mastery but it is unambiguous?)

(It needs more clarification between ambiguity and material mastery. Ambiguity relates to the ability to deliver something, therefore it is not quite related to the material mastery).

However, the writing expert argued that the descriptors in this aspect were complicated as the researcher involved some substances in each score such as relevant and various expressions, ambiguity, content mastery, and supporting sentences. In fact, the researcher designed an analytical rubric in which it should describe and score the aspects of a composition separately. The expert also added that there was almost no relation between ambiguity and content mastery. Ambiguity related to meaning whether it had single or more interpretation. Meanwhile, content mastery related to the understanding of the composition. Therefore, the researcher should revise the descriptors which represented the
criteria of relevancy and adequacy of content and met the characteristics of an analytical rubric.

Table 18: The Differences of the Descriptors of Relevancy and Adequacy of Content in the First and Second Drafts of the Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Before the Revision (First Draft)</th>
<th>After the Revision (Second Draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>... sangat baik dengan selalu menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi ... lebih komunikatif ...</td>
<td>... selalu menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan tiga atau lebih variasi ungkapan) ... menunjukan penguasaan materi, tidak ambigu, dan melibatkan kalimat pendukung ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>... baik dengan sering menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi ... komunikatif ...</td>
<td>... sering menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan tiga variasi ungkapan), ... cukup menunjukan penguasaan materi, tidak ambigu, dan melibatkan kalimat pendukung ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>... tidak baik dengan sangat jarang atau tidak pernah menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi ... tidak komunikatif ...</td>
<td>... sangat jarang atau tidak pernah menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi, ... tidak menunjukan penguasaan materi, serta tidak melibatkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>... kurang baik dengan jarang atau hanya sedikit menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi ... kurang komunikatif ...</td>
<td>... jarang atau hanya sedikit menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi, ... sangat kurang menunjukan penguasaan materi, banyak terdapat keambiguan, dan sangat kurang melibatkan kalimat pendukung ... (... using rarely or few relevant and various expressions, ... not quite generate content mastery of the composition, many ambiguities, and does not quite involve supporting sentences ...).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>... cukup baik dengan kadang-kadang menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi ... cukup komunikatif ...</td>
<td>...kadang-kadang menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya; dengan menggunakan dua variasi ungkapan), ... kurang menunjukan penguasaan materi, sedikit ambigu, dan kurang melibatkan kalimat pendukung ... (... sometimes using relevant and various expressions (for instance: using two various expressions), ... a little bit ambiguous composition that generates less content mastery and involves a few supporting sentences ...).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (... quite well by sometimes using various expressions ... quite communicative...).
- (... not quite well by using rarely or a few various expressions ... not quite communicative ...).
b) Compositional Organization

In the first validation, the writing expert argued that the researcher should explain how a composition which had good and well organized idea is. The researcher, then, explained that a composition which had well organization of idea was the one which arranged the idea orderly, from general to specific or conversely. She also involved the matter of repetition as the point of assessment. The writing expert agreed with the researcher’s thought that an orderly composition was the one in which the ideas were arranged from general to specific or vice versa. The general idea functioned as the introduction of the composition; while the specific one discussed the core of the composition. However, the expert did not agree with the researcher’s idea that repetition caused a disordered composition. Table 19 presents the expert’s review on the aspect of compositional organization.

Table 19: The Result of the Second Rubric Validation of Compositional Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Tidak runtut bukan selalu karena pengulangan.</em></td>
<td><em>Carilah penyebab tidak runtutnya sebuah komposisi.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(A disorderly composition is not always due to repetition).</em></td>
<td><em>(Look for cases which cause a disordered composition).</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the table above, the researcher was asked to find the cases which caused a disordered composition.

c) Cohesion

In the second validation of the rubric in the aspect of cohesion, the review given by the writing expert was almost the same as in the first validation, as provided in Table 20, i.e. asking the researcher to provide the rules of cohesion. However, the expert told the researcher that her second designed rubric was appropriate. The researcher had added pronouns and conjunctions as the additional indicators to consider in the assessment. She had also completed the descriptors with the limit of mistakes that would make the raters were easier to distinguish the indicator of each score. Table 21 provides the differences of the first and second drafts of the rubric on the aspect of cohesion.

Table 20: The Result of the Second Rubric Validation of Cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Bagaimanakah komposisi yang menunjukkan kohesi itu?</em> (How does a cohesive composition look like?)</td>
<td><em>Carilah tanda-tanda kohesi.</em> (Look for criteria of cohesion).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: The Differences of the Descriptors of Cohesion in the First and Second Drafts of the Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Before the Revision (First Draft)</th>
<th>After the Revision (Second Draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | *... padu ... ide-ide atau pokok pikiran ... berkaitan erat ...*  

(*... cohesive ... close relationship of thoughts ...*). | *... padu ... ide-ide atau pokok pikiran ... berkaitan erat ... menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.*  

(*... cohesive ... close relationship of thoughts ... uses pronouns and conjunctions correctly).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>... padu ... sedikit sekali ide-ide atau pokok pikiran ... kurang berkaitan ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(... cohesive ... only few thoughts that are less related ...).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>... cukup padu ... beberapa ide-ide atau pokok pikiran ... kurang berkaitan dengan pokok pikiran utama ... kurang ada keterkaitan antar paragraph.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(... quite cohesive ... some thoughts that are less related to the main idea ... the paragraphs are not quite cohesive).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>... kurang padu ... cukup banyak ide-ide atau pokok pikiran ... kurang berkaitan dengan pokok pikiran utama ... hampir tidak ada keterkaitan antar paragraph.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(... less cohesive ... some thoughts are less related to the main idea ... the paragraphs are less cohesive).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>... padu ... sedikit sekali ide-ide atau pokok pikiran ... kurang berkaitan ... (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari satu ide atau pokok pikiran) dan menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(... cohesive ... only a few thoughts ... that are less related ... (for instance: no more than one thought) and uses pronouns and conjunctions correctly).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>... cukup padu ... beberapa ide-ide atau pokok pikiran ... kurang berkaitan ... (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari dua ide atau pokok pikiran) dan sedikit kurang tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung (misalnya: terdapat tidak lebih dari tiga kesalahan dalam penggunaan kata ganti atau kata penghubung).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(... quite cohesive ... some thoughts ... are less related to the main idea (for instance: no more than two thoughts) and uses pronouns and conjunctions that are less appropriate (for instance: no more than three mistakes in pronouns and conjunctions).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>... kurang padu ... banyak ide-ide atau pokok pikiran ... dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tiga atau lebih ide atau pokok pikiran) dan kurang tepat dalam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(misalnya: dengan tiga atau lebih ide atau pokok pikiran) dan kurang tepat dalam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Grammar

The researcher used adverb of frequency to determine students’ mistakes in their composition. She also distinguished the number of mistakes in the basic grammatical structures and complex grammatical structures as she thought that basic grammatical structures were easier that the complex one. Table 22 provides the expert’s review on grammar.
The writing expert, then, asked the researcher a question. He asked how if the students’ composition consisted of simple but correct sentences. It was a probability that might happen in the field. Therefore, the researcher should anticipate that kind of case by providing a clear command to the students when asking them to write.

3. The Third Draft of the Rubric

Based on the writing expert’s review on the third designed rubric, the researcher made some revision. There were three aspects which had been reviewed by the expert, namely relevancy and adequacy of content, adequacy of vocabulary for purpose and grammar. Meanwhile, the rest aspects were considered appropriate at this time. The third draft of the rubric can be seen in Appendix G.

a) Relevancy and Adequacy of Content

In the second validation, the writing expert asked the researcher to revise the descriptors which represent the criteria of relevancy and adequacy of content and met the characteristics of an analytical rubric. She accommodated the expert’s suggestions and used them to revise the rubric. In the third designed rubric in the aspect of relevancy and adequacy of content, the researcher used adverbs of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Bagaimana jika siswa membuat kalimat sederhana semua tetapi kalimat tersebut benar?</em></td>
<td><em>Bisa diantisipasi dengan pemberian perintah yang jelas.</em> (It can be anticipated by giving a clear command).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 22: The Result of the Second Rubric Validation of Grammar*
frequency to determine what level of score the students’ achievement belonged to. She linked the use of relevant and adequate expressions with the resulted composition as well.

However, the writing expert argued that the use of relevant and adequate expressions were not sufficient to measure the relevancy and adequacy of composition. It was due to the relevant and adequate expressions belonged to language expressions. They were not a matter of relevancy. Therefore, the researcher should revise the descriptors in this aspect. Table 23 shows the expert’s review on the aspect of relevancy and adequacy of content in the third validation. Meanwhile, the differences of the descriptors of relevancy and adequacy of content in the second and third drafts of the rubric were presented in Table 24.

Table 23: The Result of the Third Rubric Validation of Relevancy and Adequacy of Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi” Komposisi yang menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian tidak selalu menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi yang relevan dan bervariasi merupakan bagian dari ungkapan bahasa bukan bagian dari relevansi (&quot;Relevant and various expressions” A relevant and adequate composition not always uses relevant and adequate expressions because those are part of language expression not a matter of relevance.)</td>
<td>Diperbaiki deskriptornya. (Revise the descriptor).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24: The Differences of the Descriptors of Relevancy and Adequacy of Content in the Second and Third Drafts of the Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Before the Revision (Second Draft)</th>
<th>After the Revision (Third Draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>... selalu menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan tiga atau lebih variasi ungkapan)</em> ... menunjukkan penguasaan materi, tidak ambigu, dan melibatkan kalimat pendukung... (<em>... always using relevant and various expressions (for instance: using three or more various expressions), ... unambiguous composition that generates content mastery and involves supporting sentences ...</em>)</td>
<td><em>... selalu menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan tiga atau lebih variasi ungkapan)</em> ... menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian yang erat ... (<em>... always using relevant and various expressions (for instance: using three or more various expressions) ... has close relevance and adequacy ...</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*... sering menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan tiga variasi ungkapan), ... cukup menunjukkan penguasaan materi, tidak ambigu, dan melibatkan kalimat pendukung ... (...often using relevant and various expressions (for instance: using three various expressions), ... an unambiguous composition that quite generates content mastery and involves supporting sentences ...)</td>
<td>*... sering menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan tiga variasi ungkapan) ... cukup menunjukkan hubungan ... (...often using relevant and various expressions (for instance: using three various expressions) ... has quite relevance and adequacy ...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>... kadang-kadang menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan dua variasi ungkapan), ... kurang menunjukkan penguasaan materi, sedikit ambigu, dan kurang ...</em></td>
<td><em>...kadang-kadang menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan dua variasi ungkapan) ... cukup menunjukkan hubungan dan...</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### b) Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

In the previous validation on the aspect of the adequacy of vocabulary for purpose, the writing expert did not give any review actually. However, the researcher added the phrase “generating vocational competence” in the
descriptors as she thought that this rubric was dedicated to help the writing assessment of vocational high school students. It was expected that the phrase would enlarge students’ vocabulary, especially the one which was related to their department.

Table 25: The Result of the Third Rubric Validation of Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tepat artinya sudah menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan. Jadi kosakata yang tepat artinya yang kosakata yang mengarah ke kompetensi kejuruan. (Appropriate means generate vocational competence. Therefore, the appropriate vocabulary means those which are close to the vocational competence).</td>
<td>Frasa “menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan” dalam rubrik bisa dihilangkan. (The phrase “generates vocational competence” in the rubric can be removed).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the writing expert did not agree with the researcher’s idea. In the first and second drafts of the rubric, the researcher used the appropriateness and various vocabularies as the main indicator in the descriptors to determine students’ score. The writing expert, then, told the researcher that the word “appropriate” in this rubric had covered the purpose of the phrase “generating vocational competence”. Therefore, he suggested the researcher to omit the phrase. Table 25 shows the expert’s review on the aspect adequacy of vocabulary for purpose. Meanwhile, the researcher also provided the differences of the adequacy of vocabulary for purpose in the first, second, and third drafts in Table 26.
Table 26: The Differences of the Descriptors of Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose in the First, Second and Third Drafts of the Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Before the Revision (First and Second Draft)</th>
<th>After the Revision (Third Draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(\text{... tepat dan sangat bervariasi ... tidak menunjukkan kesalahan ...} ) (\text{(... appropriate and very various vocabulary ... no mistakes ...)})</td>
<td>(\text{... tepat dan sangat bervariasi ... menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan ...} ) (\text{(... appropriate and very various vocabulary ... generates vocational competence ...)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(\text{... tepat dan bervariasi ... sedikit sekali kesalahan ... tetap memadai dan tidak mengurangi makna ...} ) (\text{(... appropriate and various vocabulary ... few mistakes ... the intent of the composition is adequate)})</td>
<td>(\text{... bervariasi ... menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan ... terdapat sedikit kesalahan ... tetap memadai dan tidak mengurangi makna ...} ) (\text{(... various vocabulary ... generates vocational competence ... few mistakes ... the intent of the composition is adequate)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(\text{... sedikit kurang tepat dan kurang bervariasi ... beberapa kesalahan ...} ) (\text{(... little bit inappropriate and less various vocabulary ... some mistakes ...)})</td>
<td>(\text{... tepat tetapi kurang bervariasi dan kadang-kadang menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan ...} ) (\text{(... appropriate but less various vocabulary and sometimes generates vocational competence in the choice of words)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(\text{... sering kurang tepat, kurang memadai, dan hampir tidak ada variasi ... agak sulit dipahami ...} ) (\text{(... often using less appropriate and almost no variation of vocabulary ... quite difficult to comprehend)})</td>
<td>(\text{... jarang atau hampir tidak tepat, tidak ada variasi dan tidak menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan ...} ) (\text{(... almost using inappropriate and no variation of vocabulary and does not generate vocational competence ...)})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Grammar

The teachers in SMK N 5 Yogyakarta told the researcher that the students’ writing would be in the form of dialogue. The writing expert, then, offered suggestions to the researcher related to the aspect of grammar that she should anticipated the length of the sentences in the dialogue. She should give clear command that the sentences should be in the form of complete sentences. The suggestions offered by the writing expert did not aim to revise the descriptors of the grammar in the designed rubric as the expert had agreed with the researcher’s idea. However, they aimed to guide the students’ to write in the appropriate length of sentences. Table 27 presents the expert review on the aspect of grammar in the third validation.

Table 27: The Result of the Third Rubric Validation of Grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jika teks nya berupa dialog, bagaimana jika hanya terdiri dari kalimat-kalimat yang pendek (misal: hanya terdiri dari satu kata)</td>
<td>Bisa diantisipasi dengan pemberian perintah yang jelas bahwa dialognya harus benar-benar tanya jawab. Jangan hanya jangan hanya menjawab what, tetapi juga harus ada alasannya. (It can be anticipated by giving a clear command that the dialogue should be a question and answer. It is not only answering the question of what, but also completing it with the reason).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The Final Draft of the Rubric

The final draft of the rubric was the one in which the content of the rubric had been accepted by the writing expert. It was considered appropriate according to theory of writing. Therefore, it could be used in the preliminary field test. The final draft of the rubric was provided in Appendix H.

C. The Tryout and the Implementation (Field Test) of the Rubric

The field test involved two kinds of actions, namely tryout and implementation. The tryout was conducted by using the final draft of the rubric for the preliminary field test to assess students’ writing. After that, the researcher conducted evaluation with the English teachers who used the rubric and made some revisions as necessary. The revised rubric was then used in the implementation.

1. The Tryout of the Rubric

a. The Description of the Tryout

The tryout of the rubric was conducted in Wednesday, February 2nd, 2011. Before conducting the tryout, the researcher and the English teachers determined the topic and the length of the composition. The topic of the composition was “Telling Past Experience” (Field Notes 7, see Appendix C). The length of the composition was about 90 words minimally (Field Notes 9, see Appendix C). Furthermore, the minimum score of English was 60. It was based on Minimum Passing Criterion (KKM) in that school. Therefore, the students should achieve at least score 60 to be said that they were competent. It was supported by this interview excerpt:
R : ... Oh iya bu, ini nilai minimalnya berapa ya?
(… How about the minimum score, Ma'am?)

T1 : Kalau disini KKM nya untuk bahasa Inggris 60.
(Here, the Minimum Passing Criterion of English (KKM) is 60).

R : Jadi besok untuk dinyatakan bahwa siswa tersebut 'competent' skor minimalnya 60 bu?
(So, the students are said to be competent when they achieve score 60 minimally?)

T1 : Ya mbak.
(Yes, miss).

(Interview Transcript 2, see Appendix D)

The tryout was conducted in X DKV B with 30 students. The description of how the tryout was conducted is shown in the following vignette.

### Conducting the Tryout in X DKV B

**Wednesday, February 2\(^{\text{nd}}\), 2011**

**10.00 a.m.**

The researcher arrived in class X DKV B to observe the tryout. The students were asked to write about "Telling Past Experience". The teacher, in this case was Mrs. TM, explained how to develop a composition of "Telling Past Experience" to the students. The teacher provided input text of "Telling Past Experience" as the example in order to make the students were familiar with the form of the composition. She also explained the grammatical rules that should be used. The teacher, in this case, integrated the skills of reading and writing by providing an input text as an example and asking the students to write a composition based on their experience. The teacher informed that the students should develop a composition at least 90 words in length. They should also pay attention to the cohesion, word choices, punctuation, capitalization and spelling of the composition as these aspects were parts of assessment. The teaching and learning process lasted for two hours of lessons (90 minutes) in which ± 20 minutes used for opening and explaining, ± 70 minutes used for developing a composition and ended with a closing prayer then.

(Field Note 9, see Appendix C)

After the tryout finished, the researcher copied the students' work and distributed them to Mrs. TM, Mrs. ABS dan Mrs. NR to be assessed by using the rubric. She also administered questionnaires to the teachers to evaluate the
designed rubric to obtain information whether the rubric was appropriate to assess students’ writing performances.

b. The Evaluation of the Tryout

The evaluation of the tryout was conducted on February 26th, 2011. The researcher discussed the result of the questionnaires administered to the English teachers to evaluate the rubric which was implemented in the tryout. The result of the evaluation from Teacher 1 is presented in Table 28. Table 29 presents the evaluation from Teacher 2 and followed by the evaluation from Teacher 3 in Table 30.

1) The Evaluation of the Tryout from Teacher 1 (T1)

The result of the evaluation from Teacher 1 shows that the rubric was appropriate to assess students’ writing as it made the students got the score according to their writing quality. However, its use needed longer time as the teacher needed to read the students’ compositions first and then matched them with the appropriate descriptors that represented their quality of writing. The teacher did not agree with the scoring technique in which the researcher gave the equal weight for the eight aspects. It was shown in the following interview excerpt:

R : Bagaimana bu rubrik yang saya buat ketika diterapkan untuk evaluasi dalam tryout?  
(How was the rubric that I designed when it was used to evaluate students’ work in the tryout?)

T1 : Kalau menurut saya rubrik yang dibuat itu sudah bagus, detail, istilahnya kalau mau menilai juga lebih mudah, .... Cuma, yang saya tidak setuju adalah bahwa masing-masing indikator memiliki prosentase nilai yang sama.
(I think the designed rubric is good, detailed and makes the assessment easier ... However, I do not agree with the same percentage for each indicator.)

(Interview Transcript 3, see Appendix D)

She argued that the students’ score would not fully represent their writing ability. The students might get a good score because they were supported by a good achievement in the aspect of mechanics, meanwhile the content did not develop well. It was supported by the following quotation of the interview:

T1 : ... tapi nek misalnya semua ini memiliki bobot yang sama, bisa terjadi dia content ngga oke, organizationnya ngga oke, tapi nanti di capitalization, spelling dan punctuationnya tinggi nilainya jadi. jadi bagus...

(... if the aspects have equal scores, it will make the students have good achievement from the aspects of capitalization, spelling and punctuation, though the content and organization of their composition are not well developed.)

(Interview Transcript 3, see Appendix D)

The teacher argued that the writing aspects had no equal importance. Therefore, they should be organized and weighted according to their role in writing as represented in the following extract.

R : Kalau menurut ibu biar adil bagaimana bu?
(How to make the scoring fairer?)

T1 : Seperti ini ngga papa, nilai 1-2-3-4-5 ngga apa-apa tapi itu belum nilai jadi. Jadi misal relevancy and adequacy of content itu menempati berapa persen, dari keseluruhan nilai, compositional organization berapa persen, capitalization juga berapa persen, supaya nanti hasilnya juga tidak njomplang dengan yang senyatanya.
(The scores 1-2-3-4-5 are appropriate, however it is not the final score. It means, for instance, the aspect of relevancy and adequacy of content takes how many percent of the total score, and it is then followed with compositional organization and capitalization in order to make the score purer).
R : Jadi nanti dipersen-persen gitu ya bu?
(So, the scores are provided in percentage, Ma’am?)

T1 : Iya..he em. jadi ini tetep seperti ini ngga apa-apa, tapi nanti mbak buat persen-persenan sendiri untuk masing-masing indikator yang kalo semuanya dijumlah tetep 100 persen.
(Yes. There is no problem with the model, however you should give weight for each indicator in which the total score is 100.)

(Interview Transcript 3, see Appendix D)

According to the quotations of the interview above, it can be inferred that the researcher should differentiate the weight of the writing aspects in the rubric.

Table 28 shows the evaluation from Teacher 1 (T1) in the tryout.

**Table 28: The Evaluation of the Tryout from Teacher 1 (T1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini mudah digunakan untuk mengevaluasi pekerjaan siswa (writing)? (Is this rubric easy to evaluate students’ writing?)</td>
<td>Rubrik ini cukup membantu dalam evaluasi writing, tetapi penggunaannya memerlukan waktu yang cukup lama karena rubriknya sangat detail, sedangkan penilaian dari siswa tidak hanya dari writing saja. (This rubric is quite helpful to evaluate students writing performances, however it takes a long time of assessment as the rubric is very detail. In fact, the students’ assessment comes not only from writing.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apakah aspek-aspek yang menjadi kriteria penilaian dalam rubrik ini dideskripsikan dengan jelas dan apa saran ibu jika terdapat kekurangan dalam aspek tersebut?</td>
<td>Ya, aspek-aspek tersebut dideskripsikan dengan jelas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bagaimana pendapat Ibu mengenai skor dan deskriptor, apakah skor dan deskriptor tersebut sesuai dengan tingkat pencapaian yang diharapkan dari kemampuan siswa dalam menulis (writing)?</td>
<td>Menurut saya, skor dan deskriptor untuk tiap aspek jangan sama. Kedelapan aspek diurutkan sesuai dengan tingkat kepentingan, akan tetapi memiliki perbedaan dalam bobot. Misal: ada prosentase yang lebih besar untuk aspek yang dianggap lebih penting. (In my opinion, do not give the same scores and descriptors for each aspect. The eight aspects are organized according to its importance in writing, however they have different weight. For instance: the more percentage for the more important aspects.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini dapat digunakan untuk berbagai macam Writing tasks? (Can this rubric be used for various writing tasks?)</td>
<td>Menurut saya, rubrik ini bisa digunakan untuk berbagai macam writing tasks. (In my opinion, this rubric can be used for various writing tasks.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Apa saja masalah/hambatan yang Ibu hadapi dalam pelaksanaan penilaian pekerjaan siswa (writing) menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat? (What are the problems/obstacles in assessing students’ writing by using the designed rubric?)</td>
<td>Rubriknya terlalu detail sehingga membutuhkan banyak waktu untuk mengoreksi pekerjaan siswa (The rubric is too detail, so it needs longer time to assess students’ work.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bagaimanakah hasil penilaian writing siswa dengan menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat?</td>
<td>Penilaian bisa lebih menyeluruh dari aspek-aspek writing. Kepahaman siswa dalam tiap-tiap task berbeda sehingga sangat mungkin menghasilkan skor yang berbeda,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(How are the results of the students’ writing performances that are assessed by using the rubric?)

akan tetapi perbedaan tersebut tidak terlalu signifikan. Dalam task ini, nilai siswa mungkin lebih murni karena didasarkan pada skor dan deskriptor yang ada sehingga nilai mereka benar-benar diukur dari ketelitian mereka dalam menulis.

(The writing aspects can be assessed comprehensively. The students have different comprehension, so they may have different achievement. However, there are no significant differences of scores in this task. Here, the students have purer score as it is measured based on the provided score and descriptors. Therefore, their achievement is truly measured according to their writing accuracy.)

2) The Evaluation from Teacher 2 (T2)

The evaluation from Teacher 2 as presented in Table 29 shows that the rubric was appropriate to assess students’ writing. She also stated that the rubric was easy to use to assess students’ writing as the descriptors for each aspect were described clearly and represented the expected achievement. She added that the rubric can be adapted according to the needs of assessment of the given writing tasks. However, the same as T1, T2 also needed longer time as she had to read the descriptors several times in assessing students’ work as there are some aspects to consider in the assessment.

R : Kalau urutan aspeknya gimana bu?
(What about the organization of the aspects?)

T2 : Kalau menurut saya sudah benar mbak.
(I think they are organized well.)

(Interview Transcript 4, see Appendix D)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini mudah digunakan untuk mengevaluasi pekerjaan siswa (writing)? (Is this rubric easy to evaluate students’ writing?)</td>
<td>Menurut saya rubrik ini cukup mudah digunakan untuk mengevaluasi pekerjaan siswa. (I think this rubric is quite easy to evaluate students’ work.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apakah aspek-aspek yang menjadi kriteria penilaian dalam rubrik ini dideskripsikan dengan jelas dan apa saran Ibu jika terdapat kekurangan dalam aspek tersebut? (Are the criteria of the rubric clearly described and what do you suggest if there are some weaknesses in the rubric?)</td>
<td>Iya, hanya saja deskripsi dari beberapa aspek cukup panjang sehingga harus membaca berulang-ulang untuk mendapatkan point nya. (Yes. However, some aspects are described quite long so I need to reread to get the point.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bagaimana pendapat Ibu mengenai skor dan deskriptor, apakah skor dan deskriptor tersebut sesuai dengan tingkat pencapaian yang diharapkan dari kemampuan siswa dalam menulis (writing)? (What do you think about scores and descriptors, whether the scores and the descriptors described the expected students’ writing performances?)</td>
<td>Deskripsi cukup mewakili pencapaian yang diharapkan. (The description quite represents the expected achievement.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini dapat digunakan untuk berbagai macam Writing tasks? (Can this rubric be used for various writing tasks?)</td>
<td>Menurut saya rubrik ini dapat digunakan untuk berbagai macam writing tasks. Atau bisa diadaptasi jika memang ada yang kurang sesuai dengan needs tugas. (I think this rubric can be used to assess various writing tasks. It can also be adapted based on the kind of writing tasks as necessary.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Apa saja masalah/hambatan yang Ibu hadapi dalam pelaksanaan penilaian pekerjaan siswa (writing) menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat? (What are the problems/obstacles in assessing students’ writing by using the designed rubric?)</td>
<td>Hambatan hanya masalah waktu karena ada beberapa aspek yang dinilai jadi harus membaca berulang-ulang. Tetapi secara teknik penilaian tidak ada masalah. (The problem only related to the time as there are some aspects to consider, so I need to read the rubric several times. Overall, there is no problem with the assessment technique.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bagaimanakah hasil penilaian writing siswa dengan menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat? (How are the results of the students’ writing performances which are assessed by using the rubric?)</td>
<td>Menurut saya, dengan menggunakan rubrik dalam menilai, kemampuan siswa lebih bisa dilihat dari tiap-tiap aspek, aspek apa saja yang sudah bagus dan aspek apa saja yang masih perlu untuk diperbaiki. (In my opinion, the students’ comprehension in writing can be assessed in each aspect, which aspects the students had mastered and which aspects need to be improved.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) The Evaluation of the Tryout from Teacher 3 (T3)

The evaluation from Teacher 3 shows that the rubric was appropriate to assess students’ writing. It was easy to use to assess students’ writing as the descriptors for each aspect were described clearly and represented the expected achievement. However, the same as previous teachers, Teacher 3 also needed longer time as she had to read the descriptors several times in assessing students’ work. Table 30 shows the evaluation from Teacher 3 in the tryout.
Table 30: The Evaluation of the Tryout from Teacher 3 (T3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini mudah digunakan untuk mengevaluasi pekerjaan siswa?</td>
<td>Ya, rubrik ini mudah digunakan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Is this rubric easy to evaluate students' writing?)</td>
<td>(Yes, this rubric is easy to use.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apakah aspek-aspek yang menjadi kriteria penilaian dalam rubrik ini</td>
<td>Ya, aspek-aspek tersebut dideskripsikan dengan jelas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>memiliki kriteria penilaian dalam rubrik ini dideskripsikan dengan</td>
<td>(Yes, the aspects are clearly described.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jelas dan apa saran Ibu jika terdapat kekurangan dalam aspek tersebut?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bagaimana pendapat Ibu mengenai skor dan deskriptor, apakah skor dan</td>
<td>Menurut saya, skor dan deskriptor untuk tiap aspek sudah mencerminkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deskriptor tersebut sesuai dengan tingkat pencapaian yang diharapkan</td>
<td>target yang harus dicapai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dari kemampuan siswa dalam menulis?</td>
<td>(In my opinion, the scores and descriptors for each aspect are already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(What do you think about scores and descriptors, whether the scores and</td>
<td>represented the target should be achieved.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>descriptors described the expected students' writing performances?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini dapat digunakan untuk berbagai macam Writing tasks?</td>
<td>Rubrik ini bisa digunakan untuk berbagai macam writing tasks, tetapi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Can this rubric be used for various writing tasks?)</td>
<td>mungkin deskriptor nya lebih dirampingkan saja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(This rubric can be used for various writing tasks, however tighter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>descriptors are better.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Apa saja masalah/hambatan yang Ibu hadapi dalam pelaksanaan penilaian</td>
<td>Dalam menilai pekerjaan siswa membutuhkan kejelian dan harus memba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pekerjaan siswa (writing) menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat?</td>
<td>c berulang-ulang untuk setiap deskriptor skoringnya.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Besides conducting the evaluation by administering the questionnaires to the English teachers, the researcher also calculated the scores of students’ writing performances to measure the mean, the standard deviation and the reliability coefficient among raters. The mean was the average score of the students’ work. In addition, the standard deviation was the spread or dispersion of the data (Larsen-Hall, 2010). The smaller standard deviation was the one that was closer to the mean, however the larger one was more spread out.

The researcher used the Pearson Product Moment correlation in SPSS 13.0 in order to measure the reliability coefficient among raters. The students’ scores of writing in the tryout could be seen in Appendix L. Meanwhile, the mean and the standard deviation of the tryout are presented in Table 31 and the reliability coefficients of the raters are presented in Table 32.

Based on the researcher’s assessment in Table 31, it was found that the mean of the students’ writing performance was 7.0333 with a standard deviation of 6.8750. There were five students who scored under 60. Meanwhile, the mean
of the students’ writing performance from Teacher 1 was 6.8750 with a standard deviation of 1.14046 and there were four students who got score under 60. In addition, the mean of the students’ writing performance from Teacher 2 was 7.1917 with a standard deviation of 1.27422. The standard deviation in the assessment conducted by Teacher 2 was the highest among four raters. In the assessment conducted by Teacher 3, on the other hand, there was the lowest standard deviation 0.93653 with a mean of 6.9917. The same as Teacher 1, there were four students who got score under 60 in the assessment conducted by Teacher 2 and Teacher 3.

Table 31: The Result of the Students’ Writing Performance in the Tryout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Teacher 1 (T1)</th>
<th>Teacher 2 (T2)</th>
<th>Teacher 3 (T3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.0333</td>
<td>6.8750</td>
<td>7.1917</td>
<td>6.9917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.24349</td>
<td>1.14046</td>
<td>1.27422</td>
<td>.93653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the computation of inter-rater reliability showed that the reliability coefficients were all above 0.800. It means that there was a high agreement between the researcher and the English teachers on the consistency of the students’ writing score and the scores were reliable.
Table 32: The Reliability Coefficient of the Raters in the Tryout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Teacher1</th>
<th>Teacher2</th>
<th>Teacher3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.967(**)</td>
<td>.964(**)</td>
<td>.902(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.967(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.954(**)</td>
<td>.935(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.964(**)</td>
<td>.954(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.915(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.902(**)</td>
<td>.935(**)</td>
<td>.915(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c. The Revision of the Rubric after the Tryout**

Based on the evaluation with the English teachers in the tryout, there was a point to consider revising the rubric. It was related to the scoring technique of the rubric. The teachers suggested the researcher gave different weight to the writing aspects in the rubric. However, there was no suggestion related to the content of the rubric. It means that the English teachers agreed with the substance of the designed rubric.

There were some experts who have presented rubrics for assessing writing. Anderson in Hughes (2003), for instance, who devises a rubric based on an oral ability scale found in Harris (1968), gives an equal weight for his designed rubric. On the other hand, Jacobs et al. (1981) provide different weights for the rubric as they argue that the weightings reflect the perceived importance of different components in writing (Hughes, 2003).
Jacobs et al. (1981) design an analytical rubric which was widely used in college level in North America. The designed rubric has five aspects, namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Jacobs et al (1981) give 'content' the greatest weight and 'mechanics' the least. They give 30 percent weight for content, while organization and vocabulary have the same weight that is 20 percent. The language use, in addition, is weighted 25 percent and mechanics 5 percent. A student's total score then is the sum of the weighted scores.

In line with the theory above and the suggestion offered by the English teachers, the researcher, then revised the rubric. She weighted the aspects in the rubric. McNamara (1996) mentions that there is no particular basis of how weightings in the rubric are derived. Therefore, the researcher made adjustment in weightings as there were eight aspects in her designed rubric. She could not directly adapt the weighting model proposed by Jacobs et al. (1981) as the number of aspects of assessment was different.

The aspects related to content such as relevancy and adequacy of content and cohesion had the highest percentage that was 20 percent of the total score. Then, the score achieved in each aspect would be multiplied by four. The aspects of compositional organization, adequacy of vocabulary for purpose and grammar had the same percentage that was 15 percent of the total score. The score achieved in each aspect then would be multiplied by three. However, the percentage of each aspect of mechanics was 5 percent or the scores in the aspects of mechanics would be multiplied by one. The highest total score in the designed
rubric would be 100, while the lowest one would be 20. The rubric which had been revised after the tryout could be seen in Appendix J. It then would be used to assess students’ writing performance in the implementation stage.

2. The Implementation of the Rubric

a. The Description of the Implementation

The implementation of the rubric was conducted on Tuesday, March 15th, 2011. The topic used in the implementation was the same as the one used in the tryout, that was “Telling Past Experience”. The description of how the implementation was conducted is shown in the following vignette.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conducting the Implementation in X Animasi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, March 15th, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher arrived in class X Animasi to observe the implementation of the rubric to get the data for the study. The teaching and learning process to the previous tryout. The students were also asked to write a composition of “Telling Past Experience” so that the achievement can be compared on the same task. Mrs. TM, as the teacher, explained the steps to develop a composition of “Telling Past Experience” to the students. The teacher provided input text of “Telling Past Experience” as the example in order to make the students were familiar with the form of the composition. She also explained the grammatical rules which should be used. The students should write a composition at least 90 words in length. They should also pay attention to the aspects of writing as these aspects were parts of assessment. The teaching and learning process lasted for two hours of lessons (90 minutes) with the similar time allocation in which ± 20 minutes used for opening and explaining, ± 70 minutes used for developing a composition and ended with a close.

(Field Note 13, see Appendix C)

In the implementation of the rubric which was conducted in X Animasi with 29 students, the students should also write a composition with the same length as tryout, that was about 90 words minimally with the minimum score 60. After the
implementation finished, the researcher copied the students’ work and distributed them to Mrs. TM, Mrs. ABS dan Mrs. NR to be assessed by using the revised rubric after the tryout.

b. The Evaluation of the Implementation

The evaluation of the implementation was conducted on April 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2011.

The researcher interviewed the English teachers for collecting their experience in assessing students’ writing performance by using the revised rubric. Furthermore, the description of how the evaluation of the implementation was conducted is shown in the following vignette.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Evaluating the Implementation} \\
\textbf{Friday, April 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2011} \\
\textbf{09.15 a.m.} \\
\hline
The researcher arrived to the school at 09:15 and went to teachers’ room. She met the three English teachers, Mrs. TM, Mrs. ABS and Mrs. NR. The teachers gave the students’ score in the implementation to the researcher. In contrast to the tryout, there was no evaluation on the rubric used in the implementation as all the offered suggestions from the teachers in the evaluation of the tryout had been accommodated and used by researcher to revise the rubric. Thus, the rubric used in the implementation was more acceptable. The researcher did not administer questionnaires as there were no changes in the content of the designed rubric. The evaluation was conducted through the interviews with the research respondents (the English teachers). The more complete evaluation was provided in Appendix D. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

(Field Note 14, see Appendix C)

The researcher did not administer questionnaires as the teachers had agreed with the content of the designed rubric. It was supported by the following excerpt.

\begin{center}
\textbf{R} \quad : \textit{Kalau untuk content atau isi rubriknya bagaimana bu?} \\
(What about the content of the rubric, Ma’am?) \\

\textbf{T3} \quad : \textit{Menurut saya sudah bagus mbak.} \\
(I think it is good.) \\
\end{center}

(Interview Transcript 5, see Appendix D)
R : Kalau untuk content nya sendiri bagaimana bu?
(What about the content?)

Tl : Menurut saya ngga ada masalah mbak.
(I think there is no problem.)

(Interview Transcript 7, see Appendix D)

In relation to the weightings in the revised rubric, the English teachers had the same agreement. They agreed with the percentage of each aspect in the rubric as they thought that the weightings would make the students’ obtained score more reliable. It was supported by the excerpt in the next page.

R : Bagaimana bu hasil implementasinya?
(What about the result of the implementation?)

Tl : Kalau dilihat dari hasilnya lebih bagus mbak dari tryout, dan menurut saya lebih murni.
(It is better and purer than the tryout.)

R : Maksudnya lebih murni bu?
(What does purer mean?)

Tl : Iya, karena pembobotan itu, jadi aspek yang penting memiliki skor yang lebih tinggi. Seperti relevancy, dan cohesion bobotnya kan paling tinggi, kemudian ehm...apa itu...compositional, vocab dan grammar ada satu tingkat dibawahnya, dan yang terakhir mechanics. Jadi kalau siswa bagus di relevancy dan cohesion, juga compositional nilai mereka akan bagus. Tapi jika di aspek depan mereka jatuh tapi terbantu di mechanics kan nilainya jadi bagus mbak, padahal kan yang kita harapkan dari writing itu sendiri kan siswa mampu menulis komposisi yang nyambung dan padu to?
(Yes, it is because of the weighting, so that the more important aspects have the greater weight. Relevancy and cohesion, for instance, have the highest weight, and then...err...compositional, vocabulary and grammar are laid a level below, and mechanics at last. Therefore, if the students are good in relevancy, cohesion, as well as compositional, they will achieve a good score. They still also have a good score if they get good scores in mechanics although they are weak in those aspects. In fact, we (the teachers) expect that the students are able to develop a cohesive composition.)

(Interview Transcript 7, see Appendix D)
R : Bagaimana dengan pembobotan untuk skor nya bu?
(What about the weighting, Ma’am?)

T3 : Memurut saya sudah bagus mbak, karena kemampuan siswa bisa diukur dari caranya memuangkan ide dan tidak terlalu terbantu oleh skor mechanics walaupun mechanics itu juga penting.
(I think it is good as it measures the students’ ability in generating idea without any influence of mechanics though they are also important.)

(Interview Transcript 5, see Appendix D)

R : Bagaimana dengan pembobotan untuk skor nya bu?
(What about the weighting, Ma’am?)

T2 : Memurut saya sudah bagus mbak, dengan pembobotan apa yang diharapkan dari writing itu bisa tercapai. Intinya writing itu kan ide nya to, bukan tanda bacanya, walaupun tanda baca, spelling, dan capitalization itu penting. Tapi, harapan nyanya kan ketiga aspek itu tidak mendominasi nilai siswa karena kemampuan siswa bisa diukur dari caranya memuangkan ide dan tidak terlalu terbantu oleh skor mechanics walaupun mechanics itu juga penting.
(I think it is good. What is expected from weighting can be achieved by weighting the writing aspects. The essential aspect in writing is the idea of the composition, not the punctuation though punctuation, spelling and capitalization are also important in writing. However, those three aspects are not expected to dominate the students’ achievement in writing as the students’ ability in generating idea is measured without any influence of mechanics though they are also important.)

(Interview Transcript 6, see Appendix D)

R : ... tapi ada nilai siswa yang rendah sekali, yang mungkin jika dinilai secara holistic skornya lebih tinggi bu. Menurut ibu bagaimana?
(... however, there are some students who achieved very low scores in which the scores might have been higher if they were assessed holistically. What do you think, Ma’am?)

(It is an analytical rubric which assesses students’ comprehension on each aspect. If the students finally achieve a low score, it indicates that they have not yet understood.)
The researcher used the Pearson Product Moment correlation in SPSS 13.0 in order to measure the reliability coefficient among raters. The students’ scores of writing in the implementation could be seen in Appendix L. Meanwhile, the mean and standard deviation of the implementation are presented in Table 33 and the reliability coefficients of the raters are presented in Table 34.

Table 33: The Result of the Students’ Writing Performance in the Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Teacher 1 (T1)</th>
<th>Teacher 2 (T2)</th>
<th>Teacher 3 (T3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>57.7931</td>
<td>55.8276</td>
<td>57.5862</td>
<td>57.4483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation (SD)</td>
<td>19.33424</td>
<td>17.28556</td>
<td>18.61934</td>
<td>18.69795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of the Students (N)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the researcher’s assessment in Table 33, it was found that the mean of the students’ writing performance was 57.7931 with a standard deviation of 19.33424. The researcher had the highest standard deviation among four raters. On the other hand, Teacher 1 had the lowest standard deviation among the raters 17.28556 with a mean of 55.8276. Teacher 2, in addition, had the mean of students’ writing performance 57.5862 with a standard deviation of 18.61934. Meanwhile, in the assessment conducted by Teacher 3, the mean was 57.4483 with a standard deviation of 18.69795. Many students scored under 60 in the
implementation. It might be caused by the scoring technique in which each aspect had different weight. Therefore, if the students were weak in the aspects which were multiplied by four or multiplied by three, they would achieve a low score.

Moreover, the computation of inter-rater reliability in the implementation showed that the reliability coefficient were all above 0.800. It means that there was a high agreement between the researcher and the English teachers on the consistency of the students’ writing score and the scores were reliable.

Table 34: The Reliability Coefficient of the Raters in the Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Teacher1</th>
<th>Teacher2</th>
<th>Teacher3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.987(**)</td>
<td>.980(**)</td>
<td>.973(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.987(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.981(**)</td>
<td>.966(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.980(**)</td>
<td>.981(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.973(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.973(**)</td>
<td>.966(**)</td>
<td>.973(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. The Final Designed Rubric

The final designed rubric was the one which had been used in the implementation. It had eight aspects of writing in which the aspects were still the same as the designed rubric for the preliminary field test. However, there was a difference in the scoring technique. In the designed rubric for the preliminary field test the researcher gave the equal weight for each aspect of writing, however she weighted the aspects differently in the final designed rubric. The researcher made the revision according to the suggestions offered by the English teachers.
who used the rubric to assess students' writing as they could figure out the strengths and the weaknesses after they implemented it in the assessment. The final designed rubric could be seen in Appendix J.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter consists of two sections, namely conclusions and suggestions. Conclusions summarize the analysis results as answers to research question. Suggestions give recommendations on what to do as a follow-up of the research or what improvement should be made for the next study in the same field.

A. CONCLUSIONS

The researcher concerns her study in designing a rubric to assess vocational students’ writing. She specifies the designed rubric on an analytical writing rubric. It is intended to be one of the real efforts to overcome the problems related to assessing writing which is less available for vocational high schools.

The rubric was designed based on the result of the needs analysis which was supported with some relevant theories in order to make the rubric was appropriate for assessing students’ writing performance in vocational high schools. The rubric contained some aspects of writing performance, indicators of good performances, five levels of scores, and descriptor in each level of score in order to make the rubric was suitable and provided a more detailed information of students’ achievement.

The aspects of writing performance in the rubric were relevance and adequacy of content, compositional organization, cohesion, adequacy of vocabulary for purpose, grammar, mechanical accuracy I (punctuation), mechanical accuracy II (spelling) and mechanical accuracy III (capitalization). The aspects were considered important to make a comprehensive assessment.
Each aspect had criteria which contained indicators of good performance. The students' performance could be identified through the five levels of score in the rubric. Each level of score had its descriptor which described specifically what performance looked like. Furthermore, the evaluation in the tryout and implementation showed that the rubric could be used to assess students' writing. The rubric also had high agreement among raters as the reliability coefficients were all above 0.900.

B. SUGGESTIONS

1. To English Teachers

The English teachers in the evaluation told that the rubric can be used to assess various writing tasks. However, due to the limited time, the researcher only field-tested the rubric to assess students' writing to the same topic of writing, that was "Telling Past Experience". Therefore, it is expected that the English teachers also implement the rubric to assess other tasks of writing in order to make further improvement to the assessment tool. The teachers can also design the rubric themselves to make the rubric is appropriate to particular needs of the students. The teachers may refer to the syllabus to define the general criterion of achievement before it is classified into specific attainment indicator for each level of score.

2. To other Researchers

The designed rubric in this study is expected to give input to conduct similar research to other researchers. By knowing the research procedures and the
processes of designing the rubric, it is expected that other researchers are interested in designing rubrics for other skills of English which are not restricted only to vocational high school students’ writing. However, there are some points to be considered before designing the rubric such as practicality and language use. Practicality means the rubric should be suitable to students’ needs so it gives beneficial contribution to the students’ performances as they can be assessed in detail. Language use, in addition, means the rubric should be clearly described to avoid ambiguity.
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ANGKET ANALISIS KEBUTUHAN PENGEMBANGAN PENILAIAN MATA
PELAJARAN BAHASA INGGRIS UNTUK GURU BAHASA INGGRIS
DI SMK NEGERI 5 YOGYAKARTA

Yth : Guru Bahasa Inggris
Di SMK Negeri 5
Yogyakarta

Dalam rangka penelitian dan pengembangan penilaian bahasa Inggris, saya mengharap kesediaan bapak/ibu guru bahasa Inggris untuk mengisi angket berikut ini. Angket berikut ini diperlukan sebagai tahap awal penelitian untuk mengetahui kebutuhan (needs) dalam mata pelajaran bahasa Inggris. Angket ini lebih dikhususkan untuk aktivitas menulis (writing) siswa dalam bahasa Inggris dimana tanggapan dari bapak/ibu guru bahasa Inggris akan dipergunakan sebagai masukan atau bahan pertimbangan dalam pembuatan rubrik penilaian sebagai alat untuk mengevaluasi hasil tulisan (writing product) siswa.

Angket ini terbagi menjadi 2 (dua) bagian. Bagian pertama bertujuan untuk mengetahui gambaran umum mengenai diri bapak/ibu guru dan bagian kedua bertujuan untuk mengetahui tanggapan bapak/ibu guru mengenai beberapa pertanyaan dalam angket ini.

Angket ini tidak bermaksud untuk menguji atau menilai bapak/ibu guru, melainkan untuk mengetahui gambaran tentang aktivitas dan cara penilaian bapak/ibu guru untuk mata pelajaran bahasa Inggris, khususnya aktivitas menulis (writing) siswa yang sesuai dengan kebutuhan di sekolah bapak/ibu guru.

Atas bantuan dan kesediaan bapak/ibu guru dalam mengisi angket ini, saya haturkan terima kasih.

Ingrita Dewi Puspasari
06202241042
Mahasiswa Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
BAGIAN PERTAMA
Gambaran umum mengenai diri bapak/ibu guru

1. Nama : .......................................................... 
2. Kelas yang diampu .................................................

3. Latar belakang pendidikan 

4. Pengalaman mengajar ..............................................

5. Seminar/pelatihan yang pernah diikuti ....................................

BAGIAN KEDUA
Tanggapan bapak/ibu guru mengenai beberapa pertanyaan di bawah ini

1. SMK adalah sekolah menegah kejuruan dimana terdapat berbagai macam jurusan/bidang keahlian di dalamnya. Lalu, bagaimana dengan pengajaran bahasa Inggris di SMK? Adakah materi bahasa Inggris yang membedakan untuk masing-masing jurusan/bidang keahlian?

.......................................................... 
.......................................................... 
.......................................................... 
.......................................................... 
.......................................................... 
..........................................................
2. *Skills* dalam bahasa Inggris terbagi menjadi 4 (empat) yaitu *reading*, *writing*, *listening* dan *speaking*. Bagaimana cara bapak/ibu mengajarkan keempat *skills* tersebut? Adakah perbedaan porsi waktu pengajaran untuk masing-masing *skill*?

3. *Tasks* apa saja yang biasa dikerjakan dalam *writing*?

4. Bagaimana cara bapak/ibu menilai hasil tulisan (*writing product*) siswa? Apakah bapak/ibu menggunakan rubrik?
5. Menurut bapak/ibu, dari keempat skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking), manakah yang paling sulit untuk diajarkan dan dievaluasi?


7. Dalam penelitian ini, saya akan mengembangkan rubrik untuk menilai/mengevaluasi writing product siswa. Menurut bapak/ibu, kriteria apa saja yang harus ada dalam rubrik tersebut?
8. Menurut bapak/ibu, kriteria yang termuat dalam rubrik sebaiknya sesuai dengan indikator yang termuat dalam silabus, indikator yang sesuai dengan *tasks*, atau indikator yang dirasa perlu saja?

9. Menurut bapak/ibu, apakah guru perlu memberitahu siswa tentang cara penilaian dan kriteria yang menjadi pertimbangan dalam penilaian sebelum memberikan *assignment/task* yang akan diambil nilainya?

Terima kasih
The Result of the Validation of an Analytical Rubric to Assess Vocational High School Students’ Writing Performances in the Preliminary Field Test

Validation: (Day and Date)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Aspects of Assessment</th>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Compositional organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (Punctuation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (Spelling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (Capitalization)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluator

(..................)
Evaluasi Guru dalam Uji Coba (Tryout) Analytical Rubric untuk Menilai Pekerjaan Menulis (Writing) Siswa SMK

Hari & Tanggal Evaluasi: ...............  
Guru : ............... ... 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pertanyaan</th>
<th>Jawaban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini mudah digunakan untuk mengevaluasi pekerjaan siswa (writing)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apakah aspek-aspek yang menjadi kriteria penilaian dalam rubrik ini dideskripsikan dengan jelas dan apa saran Ibu jika terdapat kekurangan dalam aspek tersebut?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bagaimana pendapat Ibu mengenai skor dan deskriptor, apakah skor dan deskriptor tersebut sesuai dengan tingkat pencapaian yang diharapkan dari kemampuan siswa dalam menulis (writing)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pertanyaan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini dapat digunakan untuk berbagai macam <em>Writing tasks</em>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Apa saja masalah/hambatan yang Ibu hadapi dalam pelaksanaan penilaian pekerjaan siswa (<em>writing</em>) menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bagaimanakah hasil penilaian <em>writing</em> siswa dengan menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

THE RESULT OF THE NEEDS ANALYSIS
THE RESULT OF THE NEEDS ANALYSIS

(Teacher 1)

BAGIAN PERTAMA
Gambaran umum mengenai diri bapak/ibu guru

1. Nama : Mrs. TM
2. Kelas yang diampu : X and XI
3. Latar belakang pendidikan : S1
4. Pengalaman mengajar : 8 tahun
5. Seminar/pelatihan : - Pembelajaran dengan TIK (SEAMOLEC yang pernah diikuti Jakarta)
   - Creative Teaching Method Workshop (Yogyakarta)

BAGIAN KEDUA
Tanggapan bapak/ibu guru mengenai beberapa pertanyaan di bawah ini

1. SMK adalah sekolah menegah kejuruan dimana terdapat berbagai macam jurusan/bidang keahlian di dalamnya. Lalu, bagaimana dengan pengajaran bahasa Inggris di SMK? Adakah materi bahasa Inggris yang membedakan untuk masing-masing jurusan/bidang keahlian?
   - Ada penambahan kosakata tertentu untuk masing-masing jurusan.

2. Skills dalam bahasa Inggris terbagi menjadi 4 (empat) yaitu reading, writing, listening dan speaking. Bagaimana cara bapak/ibu mengajarkan keempat skills tersebut? Adakah perbedaan porsi waktu pengajaran untuk masing-masing skill?
   - Listening diperkenalkan di setiap topik baru.
Speaking diajarkan setelah listening sehingga siswa bisa adapt dan adopt dari yang sudah diajarkan di listening.

Reading diajarkan sebisa mungkin yang sesuai dengan jurusan.

Writing diajarkan yang paling akhir dari semua skills.

Biasanya ada perbedaan porsi L:S:R:W = 1:2:2:2

3. Tasks apa saja yang biasa dikerjakan dalam writing?
   - Vocabulary building
   - Free writing
   - Arrange sentences into a good paragraph
   - Translating (Indonesia-English or on the contrary)

4. Bagaimana cara bapak/ibu menilai hasil tulisan / writing product siswa?
   Apakah ibu menggunakan rubrik?
   - Menilai dari • grammar
     - perkembangan vocab yang digunakan
     - tulisan
     - ide
   - Belum spesifik dalam menggunakan rubrik.

5. Menurut bapak/ibu, dari keempat skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking), manakah yang paling sulit untuk diajarkan dan dievaluasi?
   - Semua memiliki keunikan tersendiri dalam metode pengajaran dan penilaianannya. Jika semua sudah menggunakan rubrik untuk penilaianannya maka itu akan mempermudah dalam penilaian tiap skill.

6. Menurut bapak/ibu, bagaimana kemampuan menulis siswa di sekolah ini?
   Adakah kelemahan mereka dalam menulis? Jika ada, bagaimana cara bapak/ibu mengatasinya?
   - Kemampuan siswa untuk menulis masih dalam taraf novice-level. Kelemahan mereka adalah tentang kosakata dan grammar. Untuk
kosakata, pernah saya cobakan untuk menulis *diary* setiap hari dan
dikumpulkan setiap minggu. Tetapi, kendalanya sulit untuk
mengevaluasi semua. Meski memang terjadi peningkatan yang
signifikan pada kemampuan kosakata dan *grammar*.

7. Dalam penelitian ini, saya akan mengembangkan rubrik untuk
menilai/mengevaluasi *writing product* siswa. Menurut bapak/ibu, kriteria
apa saja yang harus ada dalam rubrik tersebut?

   - Kosakata
   - Cohesion
   - Grammar
   - Idea

8. Menurut bapak/ibu, kriteria yang termuat dalam rubrik sebaiknya sesuai
dengan indikator yang termuat dalam silabus, indikator yang sesuai
dengan *tasks*, atau indikator yang dirasa perlu saja?

   ⇒ Harus disesuaikan dengan task sehingga kadang dibutuhkan rubrik
   yang bervariasi karena model *task* yang berbeda.

9. Menurut bapak/ibu, apakah guru perlu memberitahu siswa tentang cara
penilaian dan kriteria yang menjadi pertimbangan dalam penilaian
sebelum memberikan *assignment/task* yang akan diambil nilainya?

   ⇒ Tentu, supaya siswa bisa memaksimalkan upayanya untuk
   mendapatkan nilai bagus.

Terima kasih
THE RESULT OF THE NEEDS ANALYSIS
(Teacher 2)

BAGIAN PERTAMA
Gambaran umum mengenai diri bapak/ibu guru

1. Nama : Mrs. ABS

2. Kelas yang diampu : X, XI, XII

3. Latar belakang : S2 pendidikan

4. Pengalaman : 16 tahun mengajar

5. Seminar/pelatihan :
   - Pembelajaran dengan TIK (SEAMOLEC yang pernah diikuti Jakarta)
   - Creative Teaching Method Workshop (Yogyakarta)
   - Diklat TIK untuk RSBi

BAGIAN KEDUA
Tanggapan bapak/ibu guru mengenai beberapa pertanyaan di bawah ini

1. SMK adalah sekolah menegah kejuruan dimana terdapat berbagai macam jurusan/bidang keahlian di dalamnya. Lalu, bagaimana dengan pengajaran bahasa Inggris di SMK? Adakah materi bahasa Inggris yang membedakan untuk masing-masing jurusan/bidang keahlian?
   - Secara umum tidak ada perbedaan materi. Akan tetapi untuk menambah pengetahuan, biasanya disertakan vocab dan bacaan yang sesuai dengan jurusan.

2. Skills dalam bahasa Inggris terbagi menjadi 4 (empat) yaitu reading, writing, listening dan speaking. Bagaimana cara bapak/ibu mengajarkan
keempat skills tersebut? Adakah perbedaan porsi waktu pengajaran untuk masing-masing skill?

- Saya biasa memulai dari spoken cycle, jadi listening dijarkan di awal terlebih dahulu, kemudian diikuti speaking sebagai production.
- untuk written cycle, diawali dengan reading sesuai silabus dahulu kemudian baru diajarkan yang sesuai dengan jurusan misalnya diperkenalkan kosakatanya dan bacaan atau input text, kemudian diikuti writing sebagai production.
- Biasanya ada perbedaan porsi, untuk production waktunya lebih lama.

3. Tasks apa saja yang biasa dikerjakan dalam writing?
   - Vocabulary building
   - Guided & free writing
   - Arrange sentences into a good paragraph

4. Bagaimana cara bapak/ibu menilai hasil tulisan / writing product siswa? Apakah ibu menggunakan rubrik?
   - Menilai dari ide
     - kohesi & koherensi
     - grammar
     - kosakata
   - Belum menggunakan rubrik.

5. Menurut bapak/ibu, dari keempat skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking), manakah yang paling sulit untuk diajarkan dan dievaluasi?
   - Tidak ada yang sulit, tetapi untuk production (speaking dan writing) memerlukan ketelatenan dalam mengajarkan dan memberikan contoh sampai siswa benar-benar paham dan menguasai.


7. Dalam penelitian ini, saya akan mengembangkan rubrik untuk menilai/mengevaluasi writing product siswa. Menurut bapak/ibu, kriteria apa saja yang harus ada dalam rubrik tersebut?

⇒ Yang pasti yang menjadi kelemahan siswa pada umumnya yaitu grammar, kosakata, kepaduan ide. Tanda baca juga perlu dipertimbangkan.

8. Menurut bapak/ibu, kriteria yang termuat dalam rubrik sebaiknya sesuai dengan indikator yang termuat dalam silabus, indikator yang sesuai dengan tasks, atau indikator yang dirasa perlu saja?

⇒ Jika rubriknya bersifat umum, maka disesuaikan dengan indikator silabus. Akan tetapi jika diperuntukkan untuk task tertentu maka disesuaikan dengan indikator tiap task.

9. Menurut bapak/ibu, apakah guru perlu memberitahu siswa tentang cara penilaian dan kriteria yang menjadi pertimbangan dalam penilaian sebelum memberikan assignment/task yang akan diambil nilainya?

⇒ Tentu, supaya siswa bisa memiliki persiapan yang baik sehingga hasilnya pun diharapkan maksimal.

Terima kasih
THE RESULT OF THE NEEDS ANALYSIS  
(Teacher 3)

BAGIAN PERTAMA
Gambaran umum mengenai diri bapak/ibu guru

4. Nama : Mrs. NR
5. Kelas yang diampu : X and XI
6. Latar belakang pendidikan : S1
4. Pengalaman mengajar : 6 tahun
5. Seminar/pelatihan yang pernah diikuti : - Diklat TIK untuk RSB

BAGIAN KEDUA
Tanggapan bapak/ibu guru mengenai beberapa pertanyaan di bawah ini

1. SMK adalah sekolah menegah kejuruan dimana terdapat berbagai macam jurusan/bidang keahlian di dalamnya. Lalu, bagaimana dengan pengajaran bahasa Inggris di SMK? Adakah materi bahasa Inggris yang membedakan untuk masing-masing jurusan/bidang keahlian?

   * Bahasa Inggris di SMK itu *general English* karena secara akademik orientasi pengajarannya masih pada ujian sekolah dan ujian nasional yang materinya sama untuk semua jurusan. Akan tetapi, untuk membekali siswa dengan pengetahuan jurusan, biasanya disisipkan text atau materi dan kosakata yang sesuai dengan bidang mereka.

2. *Skills dalam bahasa Inggris terbagi menjadi 4 (empat) yaitu reading, writing, listening dan speaking.* Bagaimana cara bapak/ibu mengajarkan keempat skills tersebut? Adakah perbedaan porsi waktu pengajaran untuk masing-masing skill?
Diajarkan dengan mengintegrasikan keempat skills (integrated skills). Perbedaan waktu disesuaikan dengan skill(s) yang ditekankan.

3. Tasks apa saja yang biasa dikerjakan dalam writing?
   - Developing a composition (guided/free)
   - Arrange words into a sentence, then arranging sentences into a good paragraph

4. Bagaimana cara bapak/ibu menilai hasil tulisan / writing product siswa?
   Apakah ibu menggunakan rubrik?
   - Menilai dari tulisannya, kepaduan ide dan kalimatnya, grammarnya, kosakata yang digunakan, dan isi komposisinya itu sendiri.
   - Belum menggunakan rubrik.

5. Menurut bapak/ibu, dari keempat skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking), manakah yang paling sulit untuk diajarkan dan dievaluasi?
   - Masing-masing skills ada kemudahan dan kesulitan dalam mengajarkan.
   - Writing memerlukan waktu yang lebih untuk evaluasi karena harus membaca dan memperhatikan beberapa hal yang berkaitan dengan writing untuk tiap-tiap pekerjaan siswa.

6. Menurut bapak/ibu, bagaimana kemampuan menulis siswa di sekolah ini?
   Adakah kelemahan mereka dalam menulis? Jika ada, bagaimana cara bapak/ibu mengatasinya?
   - Secara umum masih dalam taraf novice-level. Walaupun begitu siswa yang memiliki kemampuannya baik juga ada, tapi belum merata. Cara mengatasi ketika mengajarkan writing saya menggunakan media seperti kartu atau media lain sehingga siswa tidak jenuh dan penjelasan menjadi lebih mudah dipahami. Dengan begitu suasana
mengajar menjadi fun dan siswa berani untuk mencoba dan bertanya ketika menemui kesulitan.

7. Dalam penelitian ini, saya akan mengembangkan rubrik untuk menilai/mengevaluasi writing product siswa. Menurut bapak/ibu, kriteria apa saja yang harus ada dalam rubrik tersebut?
   ☞ penyusunan dan kepaduan ide, misalnya dari gagasan yang umum ke khusus
   ☞ Variasi kosakata
   ☞ Grammar
   ☞ Penggunaan huruf kapital

8. Menurut bapak/ibu, kriteria yang termuat dalam rubrik sebaiknya sesuai dengan indikator yang termuat dalam silabus, indikator yang sesuai dengan tasks, atau indikator yang dirasa perlu saja?
   ☞ Indikator yang sesuai dengan silabus dan tasks, sehingga bisa meng-cover needs dari writing atau tasks itu sendiri.

9. Menurut bapak/ibu, apakah guru perlu memberitahu siswa tentang cara penilaian dan kriteria yang menjadi pertimbangan dalam penilaian sebelum memberikan assignment/task yang akan diambil nilaiannya?
   ☞ Perlu, agar siswa bisa mempersiapkan diri terutama untuk hal-hal yang menjadi aspek penilaian.

Terima kasih
APPENDIX C

FIELD NOTES
Field Note 1
Day and Date: Thursday, November 18th, 2010
Place: SMK N 5 Yogyakarta
Time: 09.35-10.45
Peneliti datang ke sekolah untuk memberikan surat ijin penelitian dari Dinas Perizinan Kota Yogyakarta kepada Kepala SMK N 5 Yogyakarta. Kemudian, peneliti diminta untuk menyerahkan surat tersebut ke bagian tata usaha sekolah dan peneliti menjelaskan maksud untuk mengadakan penelitian di sekolah tersebut. Lalu peneliti diminta untuk datang lagi ke sekolah dua hari kemudian untuk diberikan surat ijin mengadakan penelitian di SMK N 5 Yogyakarta dari kepala sekolah yang terdapat nama guru yang akan mendampingi peneliti selama pengambilan data.

Field Note 2
Day and Date: Saturday, November 20th, 2010
Place: SMK N 5 Yogyakarta
Time: 09.00-10.00
Peneliti datang ke sekolah pukul 09.00 dan langsung menuju kantor tata usaha. Dia mendapatkan surat ijin untuk mengadakan penelitian dan nama guru yang akan mendampingi peneliti. Kemudian, peneliti pergi ke ruang guru untuk menemui guru tersebut dan menjelaskan maksud peneliti untuk mengadakan penelitian di SMK N 5 Yogyakarta. Guru tersebut terlihat antusias dan bersedia untuk membantu peneliti selama pengambilan data berlangsung.

Field Note 3
Day and Date: Monday, November 22nd, 2010
Place: Teachers Room
Time: 10.00
Peneliti datang ke sekolah untuk bertemu dengan guru bahasa Inggris untuk menentukan jadwal pengambilan data. Tetapi, guru bahasa Inggris menginformasikan kepada peneliti bahwa para siswa akan menghadapi ujian akhir
semester di awal bulan Desember sehingga akan kurang efektif jika pengambilan data dilakukan saat ini. Lalu, guru tersebut menyarankan agar pengambilan data dilakukan di awal semester genap yaitu bulan Januari.

Field Note 4
Day and Date : Monday, January 17th, 2011
Place : Teachers Room
Time : 09.00-11.00
Peneliti datang ke sekolah untuk bertemu dengan Mrs. NR dimana beliau akan membantu peneliti untuk pengambilan data tugas akhir peneliti. Sebenarnya, ada tiga guru bahasa Inggris yang akan menjadi partisipan dalam pengambilan data ini yaitu Mrs. NR, Mrs. TM, dan Mrs. ABS. Akan tetapi, saat ini Peneliti hanya menemui Mrs. NR karena dua guru lainnya sedang mengajar. Peneliti menjelaskan tentang penelitian yang akan dilaksanakan kepada Mrs. NR dan meminjam silabus dari beliau untuk di copy. Setelah selesai, peneliti mengembalikan silabus kepada Mrs. NR dan meninggalkan sekolah.

Field Note 5
Day and Date : Tuesday, January 18th, 2011
Place : Teachers Room
Time : 11.20-12.45
Peneliti berencana untuk bertemu dengan Mrs. TM setelah sebelumnya membuat janji terlebih dahulu dengan mengirimkan pesan singkat. Peneliti sampai di sekolah sekitar pukul 11.20 tetapi Mrs. TM masih ada kelas dan peneliti menunggu beliau sampai selesai mengajar di ruang tamu. Pukul 11.45 Mrs. TM selesai mengajar dan peneliti diminta ke ruang guru untuk mendiskusikan tahap awal penelitian, tentang rubrik yang menjadi instrument utama, cara try-out dan implementasi untuk pengambilan data, dan juga tentang materi yang akan digunakan dalam dan implementasi (hasil wawancara dapat dilihat pada Transcript B1). Pembicaraan tersebut berlangsung kurang lebih satu jam. Pukul 12.45 peneliti meninggalkan sekolah.
Field Note 6
Day and Date: Wednesday, January 19th, 2011
Place: SMK N 5 Yogyakarta
Time: 10.00-11.00
Peneliti berencana untuk menemui Mrs. ABS, guru bahasa Inggris di SMK N 5 Yogyakarta yang juga menjadi partisipan dalam pengambilan data untuk tugas akhir peneliti. Peneliti bertemu dan berdiskusi dengan Mrs. ABS di perpustakaan sekolah selama kurang lebih satu jam. Sama halnya dengan pertemuan sebelumnya dengan Mrs. NR dan Mrs. TM, peneliti menjelaskan kepada Mrs. ABS tentang tatacara penelitian dan pengambilan data yang akan dilaksanakan. Peneliti juga menjelaskan tentang rubrik yang menjadi topik dalam tugas akhir peneliti. Kemudian, Mrs. ABS meminta peneliti untuk menunjukkan rubrik karena beliau belum mempunyai gambaran tentang rubrik. Karena peneliti tidak membawa rubrik yang dimaksud, maka kami sepakat untuk bertemu lagi minggu depan. Pukul 11.00 peneliti telah selesai berdiskusi dengan Mrs. ABS dan meninggalkan sekolah.

Field Note 7
Day and Date: Tuesday, January 25th, 2011
Place: Teachers Room
Time: 11.30
Peneliti datang ke sekolah pukul 11.30 untuk bertemu Mrs. TM, Mrs. ABS dan Mrs. NR. Peneliti akan menunjukkan rubrik kepada para guru yang menjadi partisipan dalam pengambilan data untuk tugas akhir peneliti dan menjelaskan cara penggunaan rubrik tersebut. Peneliti juga mendiskusikan materi yang akan digunakan untuk pengambilan data sesi pertama yaitu Telling Experience sebagai materi untuk tryout. Tetapi peneliti harus menunggu kurang lebih dua minggu karena saat ini siswa masih mempelajari KD 1.3.
Field Note 8
Day and Date: Wednesday, January 26th, 2011
Place: Teachers Room
Time: 10.00-11.00
Peneliti datang ke sekolah pukul 10.00 untuk memberikan lembar jawab dan rubrik yang menjadi instrumen penelitian kepada Mrs. TM, Mrs. ABS dan Mrs. NR. Lembar jawab tersebut akan dipergunakan sebagai media bagi siswa untuk menulis komposisi atau karangan yang kemudian akan dievaluasi menggunakan rubrik yang telah dibuat oleh peneliti. Peneliti beserta para guru juga menentukan KKM (Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal) untuk writing siswa. Pukul 11.00 peneliti meninggalkan sekolah.

Field Note 9
Day and Date: Wednesday, February 2nd, 2011
Place: Class X DKV B, SMK N 5 Yogyakarta
Time: 10.00
Peneliti ikut ke kelas X DKV B untuk melakukan observasi pelaksanaan tryout. Siswa diminta untuk menulis tentang past experience, dimana sebelumnya guru memberikan pengarahan dan contoh tentang past experience. Guru, dalam hal ini Mrs. TM menerangkan kepada siswa tentang cara mengembangkan komposisi past experience. Guru memberikan input text tentang contoh-contoh telling past experience sehingga siswa mengetahui bentuk komposisinya, dan juga menjelaskan tentang rambu-rambu yang harus diperhatikan, bahwa grammar yang digunakan adalah past tense. Dalam hal ini guru mengintegrasikan kemampuan membaca dan menulis (integrated skills: reading dan writing), yakni dengan memberikan input text berupa bacaan sebagai contoh dan kemudian siswa diminta menuliskan komposisi tentang past experience berdasarkan pengalaman mereka masing-masing. Sebelum production dimulai, guru menginformasikan kepada siswa bahwa panjang karangan minimal 90 kata dan siswa juga harus memperhatikan kepaduan kalimat, kosa kata yang digunakan, tanda baca, penggunaan huruf kapital dan juga ejaan karena aspek-aspek tersebut menjadi
bagian dari penilaian. KBM berlangsung selama dua jam pelajaran (90 menit) dengan perincian pembukaan dan pembekalan materi ±20 menit dan production ±70 menit dan diakhiri dengan closing. Setelah tryout selesai, peneliti menggandakan hasil tryout siswa untuk diberikan kepada Mrs. TM, Mrs. ABS dan Mrs. NR untuk kemudian dievaluasi dengan menggunakan rubrik yang telah diberikan pada kesempatan sebelumnya. Peneliti juga memberikan kuesioner untuk mengevaluasi rubrik yang dibuat oleh peneliti dan telah digunakan dalam mengevaluasi siswa.

Field Note 10
Day and Date: Thursday, February 17th, 2011
Place : SMK N 5 Yogyakarta
Time : 09.00
Peneliti datang ke sekolah untuk bertemu dengan Mrs. TM, Mrs. ABS dan Mrs. NR, guru bahasa Inggris yang menjadi partisipan dalam pengambilan data untuk tugas akhir peneliti. Peneliti berencana untuk mengambil nilai hasil tryout siswa, akan tetapi para guru belum selesai dalam mengevaluasi pekerjaan siswa karena saat itu sedang bersamaan dengan tryout ujian nasional untuk kelas XII, sehingga para guru bertugas untuk menjadi pengawas. Para guru menjanjikan untuk bertemu dengan peneliti minggu depan.

Field Note 11
Day and Date: Tuesday, February 22nd, 2011
Place : SMK N 5 Yogyakarta
Time : 10.00-13.00
Peneliti datang ke sekolah sekitar pukul 10.00 setelah sebelumnya membuat janji dengan para guru melalui pesan singkat. Kemudian peneliti bertemu dengan Mrs. TM di lobby sekolah dan kemudian kami pergi ke ruang guru. Mrs. TM menyerahkan nilai hasil tryout siswa kepada peneliti. Tak berapa lama kemudian, Mrs. ABS juga datang. Setelah berbincang beberapa saat, Mrs. ABS juga memberikan nilai hasil tryout siswa kepada peneliti. Mrs. ABS juga menunjukkan
nilai-nilai yang tinggi dan rendah dari para siswa. Peneliti harus menunggu beberapa saat untuk bisa bertemu dengan Mrs. NR karena hasil dari beliau tertinggal di rumah. Pukul 12.20 Mrs. NR kembali ke sekolah dengan membawa nilai tryout siswa dan meminta maaf kepada peneliti karena harus menunggu. Mrs. NR juga menjelaskan bahwa ada beberapa karya siswa yang kurang tepat dalam penggunaan tenses, dimana siswa tersebut menggunakan present tense yang seharusnya adalah past tense. Namun pada pertemuan kali ini, peneliti belum berkesempatan untuk mendiskusikan hasil kuesioner untuk mengevaluasi rubrik yang telah digunakan untuk mengevaluasi writing siswa. Kemudian para guru menjanjikan untuk mendiskusikan hasil kuesioner pada hari Sabtu.

Field Note 12
Day and Date: Saturday, February 26th, 2011
Place: Teachers Room
Time: 10.00-13.00
Peneliti datang ke sekolah sekitar pukul 10.00 dan langsung menuju ke ruang guru. Pertama, peneliti menemui Mrs. TM. Setelah membaca hasil kuesioner dari Mrs. TM beberapa saat, peneliti menanyakan beberapa hal tentang beberapa pertanyaan dalam kuesioner yang menurut peneliti membutuhkan penjelasan lebih lanjut (hasil wawancara dapat dilihat pada Transcript B3). Setelah itu, peneliti menemui Mrs. ABS untuk mendapatkan evaluasi tentang rubrik yang telah diterapkan dalam mengevaluasi pekerjaan siswa dalam tryout. Mrs. ABS memberikan masukan yang hampir sama dengan Mrs. TM. Yang terakhir, peneliti menemui Mrs. NR untuk mendapatkan evaluasi tryout siswa dari beliau.

Field Note 13
Day and Date: Tuesday, March 15th, 2011
Place: Class X Animasi, SMK N 5 Yogyakarta
Time: 10.00
Peneliti ikut ke kelas X Animasi untuk melakukan observasi pelaksanaan implementasi untuk pengambilan data tugas akhir peneliti. Proses KBM
berlangsung tidak jauh berbeda dengan tryout beberapa waktu lalu. Siswa di kelas ini juga diminta untuk menulis tentang past experience, dengan pertimbangan agar achievement siswa bisa dibandingkan pada task yang sama. Sebelumnya guru juga memberikan pengarahan dan contoh tentang past experience. Guru, dalam hal ini Mrs. TM juga menerangkan kepada siswa tentang cara mengembangkan komposisi past experience. Guru memberikan input text tentang contoh-contoh telling past experience sehingga siswa mengetahui bentuk komposisinya, dan juga menjelaskan tentang rambu-rambu yang harus diperhatikan, bahwa grammar yang digunakan adalah past tense. Dalam hal ini guru mengintegrasikan kemampuan membaca dan menulis (integrated skills: reading dan writing), yakni dengan memberikan input text berupa bacaan sebagai contoh dan kemudian siswa diminta menuliskan komposisi tentang past experience berdasarkan pengalaman mereka masing-masing. Sebelum production dimulai, guru menginformasikan kepada siswa bahwa panjang karangan minimal 90 kata dan siswa juga harus memperhatikan kepaduan kalimat, kosa kata yang digunakan, tanda baca, penggunaan huruf kapital dan juga ejaan karena aspek-aspek tersebut menjadi bagian dari penilaian. KBM berlangsung selama dua jam pelajaran (90 menit) dengan perincian yang hampir sama yaitu pembukaan dan pembekalan materi ±20 menit dan production ±70 menit dan diakhiri dengan penutup. Setelah implementasi selesai, peneliti menggandakan hasil karangan siswa untuk diberikan kepada Mrs. TM, Mrs. ABS dan Mrs. NR untuk kemudian dievaluasi dengan menggunakan rubrik yang telah dilakukan sedikit perubahan dari rubrik yang digunakan pada saat tryout.

Field Note 14

Day and Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011

Place: SMK N 5 Yogyakarta

Time: 09.15-11.00

Peneliti datang ke sekolah sekitar pukul 09.15 dan langsung menuju ke ruang guru. Peneliti bertemu dengan tiga guru sekaligus yaitu Mrs. TM, Mrs. ABS dan Mrs. NR. Para guru memberikan nilai hasil implementasi siswa. Berbeda dengan
tryout, kali ini tidak banyak masukan tentang rubrik yang digunakan karena memang saran dari para guru dalam evaluasi tryout telah ditampung dan digunakan oleh peneliti untuk merevisi rubrik. Sehingga, rubrik yang digunakan dalam implementasi saat ini lebih bisa diterima oleh para guru. Evaluasi dalam tahap implementasi ini tidak menggunakan kuesioner seperti sebelumnya, karena secara garis besar tidak ada perubahan yang signifikan dalam content atau isi dari rubrik yang dikembangkan oleh peneliti. Evaluasi dilakukan peneliti melalui interview dengan para guru yang menjadi partisipan (hasil evaluasi lebih lengkap bisa dilihat di transcript B5, B6, dan B7).

Field Note 15

Day and Date : Wednesday, April 27th, 2011
Place : SMK Negeri 5 Yogyakarta
Time : 10.00

Peneliti datang ke sekolah dan menuju ke bagian tata usaha untuk menginformasikan bahwa peneliti telah selesai melakukan pengambilan data dan bermaksud untuk meminta surat keterangan bahwa peneliti telah selesai melakukan penelitian. Kemudian peneliti diminta menuliskan beberapa informasi yang diperlukan untuk pembuatan surat keterangan tersebut dan peneliti diminta untuk kembali lagi ke sekolah esok untuk mengambil surat tersebut.
APPENDIX D

* INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS
TRANSCRIPT

Interview Transcript 1

Interviewer    : The Researcher (R)
Interviewee    : Mrs. TM (T1)
Day/date       : Wednesday, January 18th, 2011
Time           : 11.40 a.m.
Place          : Teachers Room

T1 : Gimana mbak?
R  : Begini bu, besok itu rencananya sudah mau mulai penelitian.
T1 : Oh iya iya, kami bantu semampu kami mbak. Penelitiannya tentang apa?
R  : Ini tentang rubrik bu.
T1 : Rubrik itu seperti apa?
R  : Ehm..rubrik itu seperti ini bu (peneliti menunjukkan contoh rubrik).
T1 : Oh begitu, trus ini nanti bagaimana penggunaannya?
R  : Iya disini nanti kan ada kriteria bu, nanti siswa diminta menulis materinya sesuai dengan KD yang sedang diajarkan saja, nanti kalau siswa sudah menulis hasil tulisan atau writing product nya siswa itu dinilai dengan menggunakan rubrik ini, begitu bu.
T1 : Ooo begitu, jadi nanti saya yang menilai?
R  : Iya nanti ibu dengan saya yang menilai, lalu nanti hasilnya dibandingkan bu, antara skor saya dengan ibu, apakah sama, hampir sama atau justru jauh berbeda.
T1 : Oh iya..trus disini siswa itu benar-benar diminta menulis ya mbak?
R  : Iya bu.
T1 : Oh ya, masalahnya kalau untuk writing siswa disini itu ngga benar-benar menulis mbak, misalnya seperti nulis short passages atau paragraf gitu, soalnya sulit sekali mbak, Siswa disini itu masih kurang dalam hal vocabulary, jadinya walaupun udah di brainstorming itu mereka tetep kesusahan, tapi nanti writing nya ada guidance nya kan? Karena bisa
dikatakan kemampuan mereka itu masih tingkat *novice* mbak, jadi masih perlu dilatih.

**R**: Iya bu, ada. Jadi nanti ada contohnya *writing*, ada contohnya materi seperti apa, cara mengerjakannya bagaimana kemudian baru mereka mengerjakan begitu bu.

**T1**: Oh ya sudah, tidak masalah kalau seperti itu. Saya itu soalnya jarang *writing* disini, jadinya kalau untuk meng-assess *writing* itu lumayan sulit ya, misalkan ada satu *sentence* saja walausah satu paragraf. Satu *sentence to be* nya salah saja bingung mau nilai gimana. Mau dinilai jelek, kasiannya siswanya, mau dinilai bagus ya salah. Tapi nanti kalau disalahkan semua juga nilaiya jeblok, soalnya rata-rata pasti ada kesalahan.

**R**: Iya bu,

**T1**: Trus ini nanti cara menilainya bagaimana, ehm..tiap-tiap aspek ini dinilai satu-satu?

**R**: Iya bu, jadi nanti tiap satu pekerjaan siswa itu dinilai dengan menggunakan rubrik ini, ada 8 aspek bu.

**T1**: Ok..jadi saya harus mbaca semuanya?

**R**: Iya bu, hehe.

**T1**: Oh, ya ya ya. Trus ini nanti untuk..ee kan..ee..ada berapa tahap?

**R**: Untuk tahapnya ada dua bu, *tryout* dan implementasi. Tahap yang awal itu *tryout*. Untuk *tryout* dan untuk implementasi itu nanti diusahakan kelasnya berbeda, soalnya agar ya ngga terpengaruh gitu bu.

**T1**: Oh gitu..ok kalau gitu, nanti untuk *tryout* kelasnya di DKV B aja, nanti implementasinya di kelas Animasi.

**R**: Oh iya bu, tidak masalah.

**T1**: Untuk materinya gimana?

**R**: Materinya nanti sesuai KD yang sedang dipelajari bu, materinya dari guru juga tidak masalah, karena disini difokuskan pada hasilnya.

**T1**: Ehm..nanti tak lihat silabus dulu ya, kira-kira materi apa yang bisa dipakai untuk *writing*. 
R : Iya bu.

T1 : Rencana tryout kapan?

R : Insyaallah minggu depan bu.

T1 : Kalau begitu ini rubriknya saya bawa dulu atau bagaimana?

R : Ehm ini bu, minggu depan saja sambil saya berikan soalnya, karena ini rubriknya belum lengkap, masih kurang capitalization. Kalau menurut ibu capitalization itu penting tidak bu untuk writing?

T1 : Yah kalau menurut saya sih mbak, capitalization itu kan ngga merubah makna ya, jadi kalau misal dia salah tapi kan mknanya dalam komposisi itu kan ngga berubah jadi kalau menurut saya ngga terlalu masalah sih. Tapi karena itu merupakan bagian dari EYD ya jadinya penting, harus ada. Terus ini nanti penilaianannya gimana? Saya nilai sendiri?

R : Setelah ibu menilai saya juga menilai bu, nanti dibandingkan, lalu untuk evaluasinya saya nanti tanya ibu apakah kesulitan menggunakan atau tidak, atau ada yang harus dikoreksi atau tidak, atau ada yang kurang sesuai dengan nature anak SMK lalu nanti masukan dari ibu itu saya gunakan untuk revisi kemudian setelah saya revisi itu nanti digunakan untuk evaluasi.

T1 : Oh gitu.

R : Ya bu.

T1 : Jadi nilainya nanti bisa beda kan antara saya dan mbak Rita?

R : Iya bu, sangat mungkin. Makanya kan nanti digunakan rubrik ini agar nilainya itu diusahakan bisa objektif berdasarkan kualitas writing nya siswa. Jika masih terdapat kesenjangan nilai yang luas antara rater satu dengan lainnya, berarti rubrik ini masih multitafsir bu, masih membutuhkan revisi.

T1 : Oh ya ya, jadi nanti saya bisa tau kemampuan anak seperti apa, kelemahannya dimana.

R : Iya bu.

T1 : Ya ya saya paham.

R : Yasudah bu, kalau begitu saya pamit dulu ya.
Tl : Ya mbak hati-hati.
R : Ya bu, terimakasih.

Interview Transcript 2
Interviewer : The Researcher (R)
Interviewee : Mrs. TM (Tl)
Day/date : Wednesday, Januari 26th, 2011
Time : 11.40 a.m.
Place : Teachers Room
R : Bu, ini answer sheet untuk tryout.
Tl : Oya mbak. Terus besok itu untuk tryout dan implementasi kelasnya sama atau beda mbak? Berapa kelas?
Tl : Lalu kalau nanti dievaluasi dengan rubrik, berarti nanti yang dilihat achievement siswa nya to? Sik saya bingung, rubrik ki sing kepiye to. Rubrik kan sing dipakai menilai, berarti kan nanti yang berubah ini nya to. Lha ini nek misale ini berubah yang diubah anapa?
Tl : Ooo begitu.
R : Iya bu. Oh iya bu, ini nilai minimalnya berapa ya?
Tl : Kalau disini KKM nya untuk bahasa Inggris 60
R : Jadi besok untuk dinyatakan bahwa siswa tersebut ‘competent’ skor minimalnya 60 bu
Tl : Ya mbak
Interview Transcript 3

Interviewer : The Researcher (R)

Interviewee : Mrs. TM (T1)

Day/date : Saturday, February 26th, 2011

Time : 10.00 a.m.

Place : Teachers Room

R : Bagaimana bu rubrik yang saya buat ketika diterapkan untuk evaluasi dalam tryout?

T1 : Kalau menurut saya rubrik yang dibuat itu sudah bagus, detail, istilahnya kalau mau menilai juga lebih mudah, ooo kalau hasilnya siswa begini-begini sudah ada nilainya, jadi sudah bisa ngira-ngira sendiri. Cuma, yang saya tidak setuju adalah bahwa masing-masing indikator memiliki prosentase nilai yang sama. Misalnya, antara relevance and adequacy of content, compositional organization, cohesion dan sampai belakang capitalization itu dia mempunyai istilahnya memiliki bobot yang sama. Padahal menurut saya, misalnya kita meneliti pekerjaan siswa pasti yang pertama kita lihat adalah content nya itu nyambung ngga, ketika content nya udah nyambung, nilai yang belakang-belakang itu mungkin agak bisa kita kasihani, katakanlah seperti itu. Tapi nek misalnya semua ini memiliki bobot yang sama, bisa terjadi dia content ngga oke, organizationnya ngga oke, tapi nanti di capitalization, spelling dan punctuationnya tinggi nilainya jadi..jadi bagus. Nah, jadi menurut saya, ngga masalah di point 1-2-3-4-5 seperti ini, tetapi tetep masing-masing..ehm..ini menurut saya sudah diurutkan dari yang paling penting sampai yang kurang, Cuma menurut saya belum dikasih bobot.

R : Trus kalau menurut ibu gimana biar adil?

T1 : Seperti ini ngga papa, nilai 1-2-3-4-5 ngga apa-apa tapi itu belum nilai jadi. Jadi misal relevancy and adequacy of content itu menempati berapa persen, dari keseluruhan nilai, compositional organization berapa persen, capitalization juga berapa persen, supaya nanti hasilnya juga tidak njomplang dengan yang senyatanya.
R : Trus untuk pembobotan itu gimana, misalnya relevancy and adequacy of content 3, compositional organization 2, cohesion 2, tapi capitalization, spelling, dan punctuation itu bagus, kan nanti nilainya jadi bagus..lalu maksudnya ibu ehm..deskripsinya yang dirubah atau....pripun bu?


R : Jadi nanti dipersen-persen gitu ya bu?

Tl : Iya..he em..jadi ini tetep seperti ini ngga apa-apa, tapi nanti mbak buat persen-persenan sendiri untuk masing-masing indikator yang kalo semuanya dijumlah tetep 100 persen. Lalu nanti akhirnya bisa dikategorikan sekian sampai sekian persen A, sekian sampai sekian B, dan seterusnya. Tapi intinya rubrik nya no problem. Walaupun kalau saya harus menerapkan ini untuk menilai memang lama tapi ketika digunakan untuk menilai sih fine-fine aja.

R : Jadi ini skor nya tetep 1-2-3-4-5 ngga apa-apa bu?

Tl : Ngga masalah skor nya tetep 5 cuma bobot nya saja yang dikaji lagi, dalam artian jangan diberikan bobot yang sama, jadi semakin penting seperti relevancy itu semakin gede prosentase nya. Istilah kalau siswa menulis capitalization nya betul semuanya tapi content nya jelek ya nilai nya tetap kurang, kan kita biasanya lihat content nya to?

R : Kalau maksudnya di-simplified-kan gimana bu?

Tl : Ehm..gimana ya mbak..mungkin point nya aja itu, tapi ngga juga ya
karena ini sudah point nya, misal di grammar..dalam rubrik tidak usah
dikasih struktur grammatikal dasar (seperti kata, frasa, dll) dan struktur
grammatikal kompleks (seperti ini..ini), tidak usah mbak..jadi biar
aturya sendiri saja yang menerjemahkan grammatikal dasar itu seperti
apa, kompleks seperti apa begitu gimana?

R : Jadi nanti hanya ditulis struktur grammatikal dasar dan kompleks tanpa
keterangan tambahan di dalam kurung ya bu?

T1 : Iya..tetapi coba nanti ditanyakan ke guru lain jika tidak ada keterangan
tambahan itu menyulitkan tidak. Tapi, rubrik ini kan untuk umum, tidak
hanya untuk siswa kami, jadi sebenarnya tetap seperti ini saja, ada
keterangan tambahannya juga tidak masalah. Intinya yang menjadi
ketidaksetujuan saya hanya cara penilaian mereka saja, untuk skor-skor dan
point-point nya tidak menjadi masalah untuk saya, hanya penilaian saja
karena tidak ada bobot nilainya. Yang saya tidak setujui kalau semuanya
diberikan bobot yang sama.

R : Iya bu, kemarin waktu saya menilai dan merekap nilai, rata-rata nilai di
spelling, punctuation dan capitalization itu bagus, tapi yang bagian depan
seperti relevancy, compositional, dan cohesion itu kurang rata-rata hanya
2, 3 gitu bu.

T1 : Iya mbak, makanya harus diberikan bobot. Misalkan kita menilai secara
umum, tidak mempertimbangkan grammar dan lain-lainnya, pasti yang
pertama kita lihat adalah contentnya, dan mungkin mereka hanya
mendapatkan nilai sedikit. Itu mendapat nilai banyak karena dibelakang
mendapatkan nilai 5, sehingga nilai itu tidak sesuai dengan ehm...apa
ya...

R : Yang kita harapkan ya bu?

T1 : Iya...tidak sesuai dengan yang kita harapkan.
Interview Transcript 4

Interviewer  : The Researcher (R)
Interviewee : Mrs. ABS (T2)

Day/date    : Saturday, February 26th, 2011
Time        : 11.00 a.m.
Place       : Teachers Room

T2 : Tadi gimana mbak dengan bu TM?
R  : Tadi sudah mendiskusikan hasil evaluasi kemarin bu, kalau menurut ibu
    sendiri rubrik untuk try-out kemarin bagaimana bu?
T2 : Kalau menurut saya, sudah bagus mbak.
R  : Ada kesulitan tidak bu?
T2 : Tidak mbak, hanya mungkin nilainya kurang adil jika semuanya sama,
    karena kemarin rata-rata siswa itu nilanya bagus di bagian belakang
    (punctuation, capitalization dan spelling).
R  : Iya bu, tadi bu tiwi juga ngendiko demikian. Kalau saman ibu bagaimana?
T2 : Gimana ya mbak, agar nilainya itu tidak berat sebelah gitu.
R  : Atau perlu diberi bobot juga bu?
T2 : Bobot gimana mbak?
R  : Ya diberi bobot bu, misalnya relevancy, compositional, dan cohesion
    berapa persen, kemudian spelling, punctuation dan capitalization itu
    berapa persen tapi persennya dibawah relevancy dll, kemudian grammar
    dan vocabulary ada ditengah-tengah bu.
T2 : Nah begitu bisa mbak. Jadi nilainya itu lebih menitik beratkan pada
    kemampuan siswa menulis, menuangkan ide. Dikelompokkan saja mbak,
    kan relevancy, compositional dan cohesion itu hampir sama, itu jadi satu
    grup, kemudian vocabulary dan grammar sendiri, kemudian mechanics
    nya sendiri berapa persen kan hampir sama juga.
R  : Kalau urutan aspeknya gimana bu?
T2 : Kalau menurut saya udah benar mbak.
R  : Kalau grammar dan vocabulary itu lebih dulu yang mana bu?
T2 : Ini writing ya, kalau writing grammar itu penting, tapi kalau speaking
saya grammar untuk accuracy nanti. Kalau writing...ehmm...tapi ya...kata tetap datang pertama mbak...vocabulary dulu...ini sudah benar mbak. Nilainya sudah jadi belum mbak?

R : Sudah bu..(sambil menunjukkan nilai)

T2 : ehmm..iya iya...ini KKM nya berapa mbak?

R : 60 bu.

Interview Transcript 5

Interviewer : The Researcher (R)
Interviewee : Mrs. NR (T3)
Day/date : Friday, April 8th, 2011
Time : 09.15 a.m.
Place : Teachers Room

R : Bagaimana bu hasil implementasinya?

T3 : Menurut saya lebih baik mbak dari tryout sebelumnya.

R : Lebih baiknya bagaimana bu?

T3 : Dalam implementasi ini anak lebih teliti dalam penggunaan tanda baca, mereka juga bisa mengembangkan komposisi dengan panjang minimal yaitu 90 kata walaupun ada satu atau dua yang masih kurang.

R : Bagaimana dengan pembobotan untuk skor nya bu?

T3 : Menurut saya sudah bagus mbak, karena kemampuan siswa bisa diukur dari caranya menuangkan ide dan tidak terlalu terbantu oleh skor mechanics walaupun mechanics itu juga penting.

R : Kalau untuk content atau isi rubriknya bagaimana bu?

T3 : Menurut saya sudah bagus mbak.

R : Terima kasih bu.

T3 : Sama-sama mbak.
Interview Transcript 6

Interviewer : The Researcher (R)
Interviewee : Mrs. ABS (T2)
Day/date : Friday, April 8th, 2011
Time : 09.45 a.m.
Place : Teachers Room

R : Bagaimana bu hasil implementasinya?
T2 : Menurut saya baik mbak, ada peningkatan nilai dibandingkan waktu tryout kemarin.
R : Kalau menurut ibu, apakah para siswa memahami aspek-aspek dalam writing?
T2 : Dilihat dari hasilnya, sepertinya anak-anak cukup memperhatikan instruksi guru untuk memperhatikan aspek-aspek writing meskipun masih sangat sederhana sekali, dalam artian kata-kata yang mereka gunakan pun masih dasar dan yang sering mereka gunakan dalam kehidupan sehari-hari.
R : Bagaimana dengan pembobotan untuk skor nya bu?
T2 : Menurut saya sudah bagus mbak, dengan pembobotan apa yang diharapkan dari writing itu bisa tercapai. Intinya writing itu kan ide nya to, bukan tanda bacanya, walaupun tanda baca, spelling, dan capitalization itu penting. Tapi, harapannya kan ketiga aspek itu tidak mendominasi nilai siswa karena kemampuan siswa bisa diukur dari caranya menuangkan ide dan tidak terlalu terbantu oleh skor mechanics walaupun mechanics itu juga penting.
R : Iya bu, tapi ada nilai siswa yang rendah sekali, yang mungkin jika dinilai secara holistic skornya lebih tinggi bu. Menurut ibu bagaimana?
R : Oh, iya ya bu..apakah ibu menemui kendala ketika menerapkan rubrik dalam implementasi ini bu?
T2 : Tidak mbak, mungkin hanya masalah waktu saja, hehe
R : Hehe..terima kasih ya bu.
T2 : Iya mbak, sama-sama.

Interview Transcript 7
Interviewer : The Researcher (R)
Interviewee : Mrs. TM (T1)
Day/date : Friday, April 8th, 2011
Time : 10.00 a.m.
Place : Teachers Room

R : Bagaimana bu hasil implementasinya?
T1 : Kalau dilihat dari hasilnya lebih bagus mbak dari tryout, dan menurut saya lebih murni.
R : Maksudnya lebih murni bu?
T1 : Iya, karena pembobotan itu, jadi aspek yang penting memiliki skor yang lebih tinggi. Seperti relevancy, dan cohesion Bobotnya kan paling tinggi, kemudian ehm...apa itu...compositional, vocab dan grammar ada satu tingkat dibawahnya, dan yang terakhir mechanics. Jadi kalau siswa bagus di relevancy dan cohesion, juga compositional nilai mereka akan bagus. Tapi jika di aspek depan mereka jatuh tapi terbantu di mechanics kan nilainya jadi bagus mbak, padahal kan yang kita harapkan dari writing itu sendiri kan siswa mampu menulis komposisi yang nyambung dan padu to?
R : Iya bu...
T1 : Maksudnya, nilai mereka baik bukan hanya karena tanda baca atau capitalization saja, begitu mbak.
R : Iya bu, saya sepandap dengan ibu. Kalau untuk content nya sendiri bagaimana bu?
T1 : Menurut saya ngga ada masalah mbak.
R : Baik bu kalau begitu, terima kasih.
T1 : Sama-sama mbak.
APPENDIX E

THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE RUBRIC
### A. Relevance and Adequacy of Content

Kriteria: mengembangkan isi komposisi yang memiliki hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan sangat baik dengan selalu menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi sehingga isi komposisi yang dihasilkan lebih komunikatif serta menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian yang erat dengan topik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan baik dengan sering menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi sehingga isi komposisi yang dihasilkan komunikatif serta menunjukkan adanya hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan cukup baik dengan kadang-kadang menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi sehingga isi komposisi yang dihasilkan cukup komunikatif serta cukup menunjukkan adanya hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan kurang baik dengan jarang atau hanya sedikit menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi sehingga isi komposisi yang dihasilkan kurang komunikatif serta kurang menunjukkan adanya hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan tidak baik dengan sangat jarang atau tidak pernah menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi sehingga isi komposisi yang dihasilkan tidak komunikatif serta tidak menunjukkan adanya hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Compositional Organization

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi yang memiliki penataan ide yang baik, runtut dan tidak ada pengulangan gagasan dalam keseluruhan komposisi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang baik, runtut serta <strong>tidak ada pengulangan gagasan</strong> dalam keseluruhan komposisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang baik, <strong>cukup runtut</strong> serta ada <strong>pengulangan gagasan</strong> dalam keseluruhan komposisi, akan tetapi komposisi yang dihasilkan cukup komunikatif dan dapat menyampaikan isi komposisinya dengan baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang <strong>kurang runtut</strong> serta ada beberapa <strong>pengulangan gagasan</strong> dalam keseluruhan komposisi sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan kurang komunikatif dan kurang dapat menyampaikan isi komposisinya dengan baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang <strong>tidak runtut</strong> serta <strong>banyak pengulangan gagasan</strong> dalam keseluruhan komposisi sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan tidak komunikatif dan tidak dapat menyampaikan isi komposisinya dengan baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang <strong>sangat tidak runtut</strong> serta <strong>sangat banyak pengulangan gagasan</strong> dalam keseluruhan komposisi sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan sangat tidak komunikatif dan cenderung membingungkan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cohesion

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi secara padu dengan ide-ide atau pokok pikiran yang saling berkaitan antar paragraf dan menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>padu</strong> dengan ide-ide atau pokok pikiran yang saling <strong>berkaitan erat</strong> antar paragraf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>padu</strong> akan tetapi terdapat sedikit sekali ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam paragraf yang <strong>kurang berkaitan</strong> dengan pokok pikiran utama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>cukup padu</strong> dan terdapat beberapa ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam paragraf yang <strong>kurang berkaitan</strong> dengan pokok pikiran utama sehingga kurang ada keterkaitan antar paragraf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>kurang padu</strong> dan terdapat cukup banyak ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam paragraf yang <strong>kurang berkaitan</strong> dengan pokok pikiran utama sehingga hampir tidak ada keterkaitan antar paragraf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>tidak padu</strong> dan terdapat banyak ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam paragraf yang <strong>tidak berkaitan</strong> dengan pokok pikiran utama sehingga paragraph terlihat seperti paragraf lepas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

Kriteria: menggunakan banyak variasi kosa kata dan pemilihan kata yang tepat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan kosa kata yang <strong>tepat dan sangat bervariasi</strong> sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi serta tidak menunjukkan kesalahan dalam pemilihannya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan kosa kata yang <strong>tepat dan bervariasi</strong> sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi serta sedikit sekali kesalahan dalam pemilihan kata, tetapi tetap memadai dan tidak mengurangi makna dari isi komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan kosa kata yang <strong>sedikit kurang tepat dan kurang bervariasi serta ada beberapa kesalahan</strong> dalam pemilihan kata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan kosa kata yang <strong>sering kurang tepat, kurang memadai, dan hampir tidak ada variasi</strong> sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan agak sulit dipahami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan kosa kata yang <strong>terbatas</strong> dan pemilihan kata yang <strong>tidak sesuai</strong> sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan kurang jelas dan sulit dipahami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Grammar

Kriteria: menggunakan struktur gramatikal sederhana dan kompleks dengan benar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa <strong>tidak pernah membuat kesalahan</strong> gramatikal dalam mengembangkan komposisi, baik pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) maupun pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa <strong>sangat jarang membuat kesalahan</strong> gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, tetapi terdapat sedikit kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat), namun kesalahan tersebut tidak terlalu mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa <strong>kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan</strong> gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, tetapi cukup banyak membuat kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut baik pada struktur dasar maupun struktur kompleks cukup mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa <strong>sering sekali membuat kesalahan</strong> gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, dan banyak sekali kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut baik pada struktur gramatikan dasar dan struktur gramatikal kompleks sangat mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa <strong>selalu membuat kesalahan</strong> gramatikal pada hampir seluruh struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dan struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut sangat mengganggu pemahaman komposisi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Mechanical Accuracy I (Punctuation)

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi dengan penggunaan tanda baca yang baik dan benar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa <strong>tidak pernah membuat kesalahan</strong> dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (&quot; &quot;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa <strong>jarang membuat kesalahan</strong> dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa sedikit kurang dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (&quot; &quot;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya, akan tetapi makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut masih dapat disampaikan dengan baik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa <strong>sering membuat kesalahan</strong> dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa kurang dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (&quot; &quot;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya sehingga makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut kurang dapat disampaikan dengan baik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa <strong>hampir selalu membuat kesalahan</strong> dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa menggunakan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (&quot; &quot;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi secara tidak tepat sehingga maka dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut cenderung membingungkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa <strong>tidak memahami fungsi dari tiap-tiap tanda baca</strong> sehingga selalu membuat kesalahan dalam penggunanya.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi dengan penulisan kata yang tepat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **tidak pernah membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
Misalnya: dalam menuliskan kata, siswa tidak terpengaruh oleh bunyi pengucapan dari kata yang dituliskan yang mungkin berbeda dari penulisannya sehingga siswa tidak membuat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata |
| 4    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **jarang membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
Misalnya: hanya terdapat sedikit sekali kesalahan dalam penulisan kata, akan tetapi maksud dari kata tersebut masih dapat disampaikan dengan baik |
| 3    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata  
Misalnya: terdapat beberapa kesalahan dalam penulisan kata, sehingga maksud dari kata tersebut kurang dapat disampaikan dengan baik |
| 2    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **sering membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
Misalnya: terdapat cukup banyak kesalahan dalam penulisan kata, dan kesalahan tersebut cukup mengganggu dalam pemahaman komposisi |
| 1    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **selalu membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
Misalnya: siswa sangat terpengaruh oleh bunyi pengucapan kata yang dituliskan, sehingga siswa menuliskan kata tersebut sesuai dengan bunyi pengucapannya hampir di seluruh kata dalam komposisi |
### H. Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)

Kriteria: mengembangkan kompisisi dengan penggunaan huruf kapital yang tepat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan tidak pernah membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan jarang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: siswa menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dengan benar, tetapi terdapat sedikit kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital selain dalam awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang harus dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 3    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: siswa membuat sedikit kesalahan dengan tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat, dan beberapa kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital selain dalam awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang harus dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 2    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan sering membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: siswa membuat beberapa kesalahan dengan tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat, dan cukup banyak kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital selain dalam awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang harus dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 1    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan sering sekali membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital |
Misalnya: siswa membuat banyak kesalahan dengan tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat, dan banyak sekali kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital selain dalam awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang harus dituliskan dengan huruf kapital
### A. Relevance and Adequacy of Content

Criteria: developing a composition that is relevant and adequate to the topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops the topic <strong>very well</strong> by <em>always using various expressions</em> so that the composition is more communicative and close in relevance and adequacy to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops the topic <strong>well</strong> by <em>often using various expressions</em> so that the content of the composition is communicative, relevant and adequate to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops the topic <strong>quite well</strong> by <em>sometimes using various expressions</em> so that the content of the composition is quite communicative, quite relevant and quite adequate to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops the topic <strong>not quite well</strong> by <em>using rarely or a few various expressions</em> so that the content of the composition is not quite communicative, not quite relevant and not quite adequate to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops the topic <strong>poorly</strong> by <em>very rare or never using various expressions</em> so that the content of the composition is uncommunicative, irrelevant and inadequate to the topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Compositional Organization

Criteria: developing a composition that has a coherent and orderly organization of idea and there is no repetition of the idea in the composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a <strong>good and orderly organization of idea</strong> and there is <strong>no repetition</strong> of the idea in the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a <strong>good and quite orderly organization of idea</strong> and there is <strong>no repetition</strong> of the idea in the composition, however the composition is communicative and conveys its intent well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a <strong>less orderly organization of idea</strong> and there are <strong>some repetitions</strong> of the idea in the composition so that the composition is less communicative and not quite good in conveying its intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a <strong>disorderly organization of idea</strong> and there are <strong>many repetitions</strong> of the idea in the composition so that the composition is uncommunicative and cannot convey its intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a <strong>very disorderly organization of idea</strong> and there are <strong>so many repetitions</strong> of the idea in the composition so that the composition is uncommunicative and tends to be confusing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cohesion

Criteria: Developing a cohesive composition with a close relationship of idea among paragraphs and using pronouns and conjunctions correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops <strong>a cohesive composition with a close relationship of thoughts</strong> among paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops <strong>a cohesive composition</strong> and <strong>there are only few thoughts that are less related</strong> to the main idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops <strong>a quite cohesive composition</strong> and there are <strong>some thoughts that are less related</strong> to the main idea so that the paragraphs are not quite cohesive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops <strong>a less cohesive composition</strong> and there are <strong>quite a lot of thoughts that are less related</strong> to the main idea so that the paragraphs are almost not cohesive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops <strong>an incohesive composition</strong> and there are <strong>many unrelated thoughts</strong> to the main idea so that the paragraphs are independent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

Criteria: using various and appropriate vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>appropriate and very various vocabulary</strong> according to the topic of composition and there are <strong>no mistakes</strong> in the choice of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>appropriate and various vocabulary</strong> according to the topic of composition and there are only <strong>few mistakes</strong> in the choice of words, however the intent of the composition is adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>little bit inappropriate and less various vocabulary</strong> and there are <strong>some mistakes</strong> in the choice of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>The student develops a composition by often using <strong>less appropriate and almost no variation of vocabulary</strong> so that the composition is quite difficult to comprehend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>limited and inappropriate vocabulary</strong> so that the composition is difficult to comprehend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Grammar

Criteria: Using basic and complex grammatical structures correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student <strong>never makes grammatical mistakes</strong> in the composition, both in <strong>basic grammatical structures</strong> (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and in <strong>complex grammatical structures</strong> (such as complex sentences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student <strong>rarely makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures</strong> (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes <strong>few mistakes in complex grammatical structures</strong> (such as complex sentences) in the composition, however the mistakes do not impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student <strong>sometimes makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures</strong> (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes <strong>quite a lot of mistakes in complex grammatical structures</strong> (such as complex sentences) in the composition and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student <strong>often makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures</strong> (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes <strong>so many mistakes in complex grammatical structures</strong> (such as complex sentences) in the composition and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures strongly impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student <strong>so often makes grammatical mistakes in almost all basic grammatical structures</strong> (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and <strong>complex grammatical structures</strong> (such as complex sentences) in the composition and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures strongly interfere in comprehending the composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Mechanical Accuracy I (Punctuation)

Criteria: developing a composition with the appropriate punctuations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student <strong>never makes mistakes</strong> in the use of punctuations. For instance: the student is able to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student <strong>rarely makes mistakes</strong> in the use of punctuations. For instance: the student is little bit unable to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition, however the meaning and the intonation of the composition are not impeded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student <strong>sometimes makes mistakes</strong> in the use of punctuations. For instance: the student is less able to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition, therefore the meaning and the intonation of the composition are slightly impeded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student <strong>often makes mistakes</strong> in the use of punctuations. For instance: the student uses the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations inappropriately in the composition, therefore the meaning and the intonation of the composition are bemused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student <strong>does not comprehend</strong> the function of punctuations, therefore he or she <strong>makes mistakes so often</strong> in the use of punctuations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)

Criteria: developing a composition with the correct spelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | The student develops a composition by **never making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: in writing the word, the student is not impeded by how the words are pronounced in which they may different from their spelling |
| 4     | The student develops a composition by **rarely making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: there are **very few mistakes** in spelling, however the **intent of the words is well delivered** |
| 3     | The student develops a composition by **sometimes making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: there are **some mistakes** in spelling, therefore the **intent of the words is not easy to deliver** |
| 2     | The student develops a composition by **often making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: there are **quite a lot of mistakes** in spelling and the **mistakes quite interfere in comprehending the composition** |
| 1     | The student develops a composition by **always making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: the student is **strongly interfered by the pronunciation of the words**, therefore he or she mostly writes the words according to their pronunciation |
### H. Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)

Criteria: developing a composition with the correct capitalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>never making mistakes</strong> in the use of capital letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4     | The student develops a composition by **rarely making mistakes** in the use of capital letters  
For instance: the student uses capital letter in the beginning of sentences, but there are few mistakes in the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
| 3     | The student develops a composition by **sometimes making mistakes** in the use of capital letters  
For instance: the student makes few mistakes by not capitalizing the beginning of sentences and there are some mistakes in the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
| 2     | The student develops a composition by **often making mistakes** in the use of capital letters  
For instance: the student makes some mistakes by not capitalizing the beginning of sentences and there are quite a lot of mistakes in the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
| 1     | The student develops a composition by **very often making mistakes** in the use of capital letters  
For instance: the student makes many mistakes by not capitalizing the beginning of sentences and there are so many mistakes in the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
APPENDIX F

* THE RESULT OF THE FIRST VALIDATION OF THE RUBRIC
* THE SECOND DRAFT OF THE RUBRIC
The Result of the Validation of an Analytical Rubric to Assess Vocational High School Students' Writing Performances in the Preliminary Field Test

First Validation: November 1st, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Aspects of Assessment</th>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>- Maksudnya komunikatif yang bagaimana?</td>
<td>- Perlu diperjelas lagi deskripsi &quot;sangat baik&quot;, &quot;baik&quot;, &quot;cukup&quot; dalam sebuah komposisi. The description of &quot;very good&quot;, &quot;good&quot;, &quot;enough&quot; in a composition need to be clarified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What does communicative look like?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Untuk mengetahui apakah sebuah komposisi mudah dipahami oleh pembaca atau tidak, maka perlu dilakukan tes pemahaman. To determine whether a composition is easy to comprehend, it is necessary to conduct a comprehension test.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Compositional organization</td>
<td>- Bagaimanakah penataan ide yang baik dan runut itu?</td>
<td>- Perlu dijelaskan bagaimanakah penataan ide yang baik dan runut.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 | Cohesion | - How does a good and well organized idea look like?  
How does a coherent and cohesive composition look like? | - (It needs to be clarified how a good and well organized idea is)  
Perlu ada patokan tentang "kepaduan" dalam komposisi. Misal: dengan menggunakan frasa, kata ganti atau kata penghubung seperti therefore, moreover yang tepat. There should be a criterion of "cohesion" in a composition. For instance: using phrases, pronouns or conjunctions such as therefore, moreover correctly. |
<p>| 4 | Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose | --- | --- |
| 5 | Grammar | - Sudah cukup mudah dipahami. It is quite easy to comprehend. | --- |
| 6 | Mechanical accuracy I (Punctuation) | - Kita tidak tahu tanda baca yang mungkin dipakai siswa dalam komposisinya. | - Jika ada rambu-rambu tanda baca dalam rubrik, maka siswa diarahkan untuk mengembangkan komposisi yang memungkinkan munculnya tanda baca tersebut. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy II (Spelling)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>We (the assessors) do not know the punctuation that the students use in their composition.</strong></td>
<td><strong>If there are punctuation rules in the rubric, the students can be directed to develop a composition that allows the punctuation to appear.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Bagaimana cara membedakan “jarang”, “kadang-kadang” dan “sering sekali?”</em> How are the criteria such as “rarely”, “sometimes” and “very often” distinguished?</td>
<td>- <em>Memberikan rambu-rambu atau pembatas</em> Misl: “sering sekali” bisa diberikan dengan rambu-rambu “kesalahan lebih dari setengah bagian dari total komposisi”, antara “sekian” sampai ”sekian” sebagai pembatas. Provide rules For instance: “very often” can be characterized by “the mistakes are more than a half of composition” between “such” to “such” as the limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Kata “disampaikan” dalam frasa ‘masih dapat disampaikan...’ dan ‘kurang dapat disampaikan...’ kurang tepat.</em> The word “delivered” in the phrase “well delivered”</td>
<td>- <em>Kata “disampaikan” diganti dengan “dipahami” karena siswa merasa benar ketika menulis</em> The word ”delivered” is replaced with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and "not quite well delivered" is less appropriate.

Score 5 and 1 have slightly different criteria.

Untuk perihal bunyi seperti "cukup mengganggu" tidak perlu dicantumkan dalam descriptor.
For a matter of pronunciation such as "quite disturbing" does not need to be mentioned in the descriptor.

If a student does not capitalize the names or words such as "John" several times in which it should be capital letter is based on its frequency not its kind

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanical accuracy III (Capitalization)</th>
<th>Score 5 dan 1 memiliki criteria agak berbeda.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Bahasa kriteria atau deskríptor disamakan dengan skor lain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes the criteria or descriptor that is equal with other scores.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Jika seorang siswa beberapa kali menuliskan nama atau kata seperti &quot;John&quot; yang seharusnya dituliskan huruf kapital tetapi dituliskan dengan huruf kecil, apakah dianggap sebagai satu kesalahan atau beberapa kesalahan sesuai dengan frekuensi munculnya?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Dibuat persetujuan bahwa kesalahan penggunaan huruf kapital dihitung berdasarkan munculnya bukan jenisnya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>&quot;comprehended&quot; because the students think that their composition is correct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Hal atau penjelasan mengenai bunyi dapat dijelaskan dalam analisis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pronunciation can be explained in the analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 8 | Make an agreement that the inappropriate use of a capital letter is based on its frequency not its kind |
The use of capital letters is the same either in the beginning of the sentences or in other parts of sentences such as in the name of place, the name of person, the name of institution, the name of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized.

- Kesalahan tidak perlu dibedakan antara kesalahan di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, tetapi kesalahan dihitung dari kata atau frasa yang seharusnya kapital tetapi tidak dituliskan dengan huruf kapital.

It does not need to distinguish the mistakes in the beginning sentences and in other parts of sentences because the mistakes are based on the words or phrases that should be capitalized but they are not written in capital letters.

Evaluator

Drs. Bambang Priyanto
## A. Relevance and Adequacy of Content

Kriteria: mengembangkan isi komposisi yang memiliki hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan selalu menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan tiga atau lebih variasi ungkapan), menghasilkan isi komposisi yang menunjukkan penguasaan materi, tidak ambigu, dan melibatkan kalimat pendukung yang mempunyai hubungan dan kesesuaian yang erat dengan topik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan sering menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan tiga variasi ungkapan), menghasilkan isi komposisi yang cukup menunjukkan penguasaan materi, tidak ambigu, dan melibatkan kalimat pendukung yang mempunyai hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan kadang-kadang menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan dua variasi ungkapan), menghasilkan isi komposisi yang kurang menunjukan penguasaan materi, sedikit ambigu, dan kurang melibatkan kalimat pendukung yang mempunyai hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan jarang atau hanya sedikit menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi, menghasilkan isi komposisi yang sangat kurang menunjukan penguasaan materi, banyak terdapat keambiguan, dan sangat kurang melibatkan kalimat pendukung yang mempunyai hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan sangat jarang atau tidak pernah menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi, menghasilkan isi komposisi yang tidak menunjukan penguasaan materi, serta tidak melibatkan kalimat pendukung yang mempunyai hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Compositional Organization

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi yang memiliki penataan ide yang koherent, runtut dan tidak ada pengulangan gagasan dalam keseluruhan komposisi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang koherent, runtut (umum-khusus), serta tidak ada pengulangan gagasan dalam keseluruhan komposisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang runtut pada pokok pikiran utama, serta ada sedikit pengulangan gagasan dalam kalimat pendukung (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari dua gagasan yang diulang), akan tetapi pengulangan tersebut tidak mempengaruhi koherensi komposisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang kurang runtut pada pokok pikiran utama, serta ada beberapa pengulangan gagasan dalam kalimat pendukung (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari tiga gagasan yang diulang), sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan kurang menunjukkan koherensi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang tidak runtut pada pokok pikiran utama, serta banyak pengulangan gagasan dalam kalimat pendukung (misalnya: dengan lebih dari tiga gagasan yang diulang), sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan hampir tidak menunjukkan koherensi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang sama sekali tidak runtut pada pokok pikiran utama, serta sangat banyak pengulangan gagasan dalam keseluruhan komposisi sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan sangat tidak menunjukkan koherensi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cohesion

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi secara padu dengan ide-ide atau pokok pikiran yang saling berkaitan antar paragraph dan menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>padu</strong> dengan ide-ide atau pokok pikiran yang saling berkaitan erat antar kalimat atau paragraf dan menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>padu</strong> dengan terdapat sedikit sekali ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf yang kurang berkaitan dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari satu ide atau pokok pikiran) dan menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>cukup padu</strong> dengan terdapat beberapa ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf yang kurang berkaitan dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari dua ide atau pokok pikiran) dan sedikit kurang tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung (misalnya: terdapat tidak lebih dari tiga kesalahan dalam penggunaan kata ganti atau kata penghubung).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>kurang padu</strong> dengan terdapat banyak ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf yang kurang berkaitan dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tiga atau lebih ide atau pokok pikiran) dan kurang tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung (misalnya: terdapat lebih dari tiga kesalahan dalam penggunaan kata ganti atau kata penghubung).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara tidak padu dan hampir seluruh ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf tidak berkaitan dengan pokok pikiran utama sehingga kalimat atau paragraf terlihat seperti paragraf lepas dan tidak tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

Kriteria: menggunakan banyak variasi kosa kata dan pemilihan kata dan menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan dalam pemilihan kosa kata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang tepat dan sangat bervariasi</strong> sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi serta <strong>menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan</strong> dalam pemilihan kosa kata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang bervariasi</strong> sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi, <strong>menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan</strong> dalam pemilihan kosa kata dan <strong>terdapat sedikit kesalahan</strong> dalam pemilihan kata, tetapi tetap memadai dan tidak mengurangi makna dari isi komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang tepat tetapi kurang bervariasi</strong> dan kadang-kadang <strong>menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan</strong> dalam pemilihan kata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang jarang atau hampir tidak tepat</strong>, <strong>tidak ada variasi</strong> dan <strong>tidak menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan</strong> dalam pemilihan kata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang terbatas dan pemilihan kata yang tidak sesuai</strong> dengan topik dan judul komposisi sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan kurang jelas dan sulit dipahami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. Grammar

Kriteria: menggunakan struktur gramatikal sederhana dan kompleks dengan benar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa tidak pernah membuat kesalahan gramatikal dalam mengembangkan komposisi, baik pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) maupun pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa sangat jarang membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, tetapi terdapat sedikit kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat), namun kesalahan tersebut tidak terlalu mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, tetapi cukup banyak membuat kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut baik pada struktur dasar maupun stuktur kompleks cukup mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa sering sekali membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, dan banyak sekali kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut baik pada struktur gramatikan dasar dan struktur gramatikal kompleks sangat mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa selalu membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada hampir seluruh struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, namun kesalahan tersebut tidak terlalu mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
majemuk setara) dan struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat
majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut sangat mengganggu
pemahaman komposisi
F. Mechanical Accuracy (Punctuation)

Kriteria: mengembangkan kompisisi dengan penggunaan tanda baca yang baik dan benar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa tidak pernah membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (“ ”) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa jarang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa sedikit kurang dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (“ ”) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya, akan tetapi makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut masih dapat disampaikan dengan baik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa sering membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa kurang dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (“ ”) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya sehingga makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut kurang dapat disampaikan dengan baik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa hampir selalu membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa menggunakan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (“ ”) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi secara tidak tepat sehingga maka dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut cenderung membingungkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa tidak memahami fungsi dari tiap-tiap tanda baca sehingga selalu membuat kesalahan dalam penggunanannya.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### G. Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi dengan penulisan kata yang tepat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan <strong>tidak pernah membuat kesalahan</strong> dalam penulisan kata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **jarang membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata dengan jumlah kesalahan tidak lebih dari 10 atau (1/9 bagian komposisi) dari keseluruhan jumlah kata dalam komposisi (± 90 kata), akan tetapi makna dari komposisi tersebut masih dapat dipahami dengan baik |
| 3    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata dengan jumlah kesalahan tidak lebih dari 20 atau (2/9 bagian komposisi) dari keseluruhan jumlah kata dalam komposisi (± 90 kata), dan makna dari komposisi tersebut kurang dapat dipahami dengan baik |
| 2    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **sering membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dengan jumlah kesalahan tidak lebih dari 30 atau (3/9 bagian komposisi) dari keseluruhan jumlah kata dalam komposisi (± 90 kata), dan kesalahan tersebut cukup mengganggu dalam pemahaman komposisi |
| 1    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **sering sekali membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dengan lebih dari 30 atau (lebih dari 1/3 bagian komposisi) dan kesalahan tersebut sangat mengganggu dalam pemahaman komposisi |
H. Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi dengan penggunaan huruf kapital yang tepat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan tidak pernah membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan jarang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: terdapat sedikit kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 3    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: terdapat beberapa kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 2    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan sering membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: terdapat cukup banyak kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 1    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan sering sekali membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: terdapat banyak kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
A. Relevance and Adequacy of Content

Criteria: developing a composition that is relevant and adequate to the topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops the topic by always using relevant and various expressions (for instance: using three or more various expressions), results an unambiguous composition that generates content mastery and involves supporting sentences that are close in relevance and adequacy to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops the topic by often using relevant and various expressions (for instance: using three various expressions), results an unambiguous composition that quite generates content mastery and involves supporting sentences that are relevant and adequate to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops the topic by sometimes using relevant and various expressions (for instance: using two various expressions), results a little bit ambiguous composition that generates less content mastery and involves a few supporting sentences that are relevant and adequate to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops the topic by using rarely or few relevant and various expressions, results a composition that does not quite generate content mastery of the composition, many ambiguities, and does not quite involve supporting sentences that are relevant and adequacy to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops the topic by very rare or never using various expressions, results a composition that does not generate content mastery and does not involve supporting sentences that are relevant and adequate to the topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Compositional Organization

Criteria: developing a composition that has a coherent and orderly organization of idea and there is no repetition of the idea in the composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a coherent and orderly (general-specific or specific-general) organization of idea and there is no repetition of it in the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with an orderly (general-specific or specific-general) organization of idea in the main sentences, and there are a few repetitions of idea in the supporting sentences (for instance: no more than two repeated idea), however the repetitions do not influence the intent of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a less orderly organization of idea in the main sentences, and there are some repetitions of idea in the supporting sentences (for instance: no more than three repeated idea) so that the composition is less coherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a disorderly organization of idea in the main sentences, and there are many repetitions of idea in the supporting sentences (for instance: more than three repeated idea) so that the composition is almost incoherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a very disorderly organization of idea both in the main and supporting sentences so that the composition is incoherent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cohesion

Criteria: Developing a cohesive composition with a close relationship of idea among paragraphs and using pronouns and conjunctions correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>cohesive composition</strong> with a close relationship of thoughts among sentences or paragraphs and <strong>uses pronouns and conjunctions correctly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>cohesive composition</strong> and there are only a few thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs that are less related to the main idea (for instance: no more than one thought) and <strong>uses pronouns and conjunctions correctly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>quite cohesive composition</strong> and there are some thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs that are less related to the main idea (for instance: no more than two thoughts) and <strong>uses pronouns and conjunctions that are less appropriate</strong> (for instance: no more than three mistakes in pronouns and conjunctions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>less cohesive composition</strong> and there are many thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs that are less related to the main idea (for instance: three or more thoughts) and <strong>uses pronouns and conjunctions that are less appropriate</strong> (for instance: more than three mistakes in pronouns and conjunctions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops an <strong>incohesive composition</strong> and almost all of thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs are unrelated to the main idea so that the sentences or paragraphs are independent and uses pronouns and conjunctions less appropriately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

Criteria: Using various vocabulary that indicate vocational competence in the choice of words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using appropriate and very various vocabulary according to the topic of composition and generates vocational competence in the choice of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using various vocabulary according to the topic of composition, generates vocational competence in the choice of words with few mistakes, however the intent of the composition is adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using appropriate but less various vocabulary and sometimes generates vocational competence in the choice of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using almost inappropriate and no variation of vocabulary and does not generate vocational competence in the choice of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using limited and inappropriate vocabulary so that the composition is difficult to comprehend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Grammar

Criteria: Using basic and complex grammatical structures correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student never makes grammatical mistakes in the composition, both in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student rarely makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes few mistakes in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) in the composition, however the mistakes do not impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student sometimes makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes quite a lot of mistakes in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) in the composition and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student often makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes so many mistakes in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) in the composition and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures strongly impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student so often makes grammatical mistakes in almost all basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures strongly interfere in comprehending the composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Mechanical Accuracy I (Punctuation)

Criteria: developing a composition with the appropriate punctuations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | The student **never makes mistakes** in the use of punctuations  
For instance: the student is able to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition |
| 4     | The student **rarely makes mistakes** in the use of punctuations  
For instance: the student is little bit unable to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition, however the meaning and the intonation of the composition are *not impeded* |
| 3     | The student **sometimes makes mistakes** in the use of punctuations  
For instance: the student is less able to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition, therefore the meaning and the intonation of the composition are *slightly impeded* |
| 2     | The student **often makes mistakes** in the use of punctuations  
For instance: the student uses the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations inappropriately in the composition, therefore the meaning and the intonation of the composition are *bemused* |
| 1     | The student **does not comprehend** the function of punctuations, therefore he or she **makes mistakes so often** in the use of punctuations |
G. Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)

Criteria: developing a composition with the correct spelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>never making mistakes</strong> in spelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4     | The student develops a composition by **rarely making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: the mistakes are not more than 10 (or 1/9 part of composition) from the total number of the words in the composition (± 90 words), however the meaning of the composition can be comprehended properly |
| 3     | The student develops a composition by **sometimes making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: the mistakes are not more than 20 (or 2/9 part of composition) from the total number of the words in the composition (± 90 words), and the meaning of the composition is **not quite well to comprehend** |
| 2     | The student develops a composition by **often making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: the mistakes are not more than 30 (or 3/9 part of composition) from the total number of the words in the composition (± 90 words), and the mistakes are **quite impeding the composition** |
| 1     | The student develops a composition by **very often making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: the mistakes are more than 30 (or 1/3 part of composition) and the mistakes are **strongly impeding the composition** |
## H. Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)

Criteria: developing a composition with the correct capitalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>never making mistakes</strong> in the use of capital letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4     | The student develops a composition by **rarely making mistakes** in the use of capital letters  
For instance: there are few mistakes in the composition by not capitalizing the beginning of the sentences, the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
| 3     | The student develops a composition by **sometimes making mistakes** in the use of capital letters  
For instance: there are some mistakes in the composition by not capitalizing the beginning of the sentences, the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
| 2     | The student develops a composition by **often making mistakes** in the use of capital letters  
For instance: there are quite a lot of mistakes in the composition by not capitalizing the beginning of the sentences, the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
| 1     | The student develops a composition by **very often making mistakes** in the use of capital letters  
For instance: there are many mistakes in the composition by not capitalizing the beginning of the sentences, the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
APPENDIX G

- The result of the second validation of the rubric
- The third draft of the rubric
The Result of the Validation of An Analytical Rubric to Assess Vocational High School Students’ Writing Performances in the Preliminary Field Test

Second Validation: November 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Aspects of Assessment</th>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Relevance and adequacy of content | - “Ambigu” dan “Penguasaan materi”.
- Bagaimana jika komposisi menunjukkan penguasaan materi tetapi ambigu atau jika komposisi tidak menunjukkan penguasaan materi tetapi tidak ambigu
- "Ambiguity" dan "Material mastery".
- How if the composition shows material mastery but it is ambiguous or if the composition does not show material mastery but it is unambiguous? | - Diperjelas lagi batas-batas antara ambigu dan penguasaan materi.
Ambigu berhubungan dengan ketrampilan menyampaikan, jadi kurang bisa dikaitkan dengan penguasaan materi.
It needs more clarification between ambiguity and material mastery.
Ambiguity relates to the ability to deliver something, therefore it is not quite related to the material mastery. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Compositional organization</th>
<th>Disorderly is not always due to repetition.</th>
<th>Look for cases which cause a disordered composition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | Cohesion                   | *Bagaimanakah komposisi yang menunjukkan kohesi itu?*  
How does a cohesive composition look like? | *Carilah tanda-tanda kohesi*  
Look for criteria of cohesion |
|   | Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose | --- | --- |
|   | Grammar                    | *Bagaimana jika siswa membuat kalimat sederhana semua tetapi kalimat tersebut benar?*  
How if the students write simple but correct sentences? | *Bisa diantisipasi dengan pemberian perintah yang jelas.*  
It can be anticipated by giving a clear command. |
<p>|   | Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation) | --- | --- |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluator

Drs. Bambang Priyanto
### A. Relevance and Adequacy of Content

Kriteria: mengembangkan isi komposisi yang memiliki hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan selalu menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan tiga atau lebih variasi ungkapan) dan menghasilkan isi komposisi yang menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian yang erat dengan topik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan sering menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan tiga variasi ungkapan) dan menghasilkan isi komposisi yang cukup menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan kadang-kadang menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi (misalnya: dengan menggunakan dua variasi ungkapan) dan komposisi yang dihasilkan masih cukup menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan jarang atau hanya sedikit menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi dan komposisi yang dihasilkan kurang menunjukan hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan topik dengan sangat jarang atau tidak pernah menggunakan ungkapan yang bervariasi dan hampir tidak menunjukan hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Compositional Organization

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi yang memiliki penataan ide yang koheren, runtut dan tidak ada pengulangan gagasan dalam keseluruhan komposisi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang koheren, runtut (umum-khusus), serta tidak ada pengulangan gagasan dalam keseluruhan komposisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang runtut (umum-khusus) pada pokok pikiran utama, serta ada sedikit pengulangan gagasan dalam kalimat pendukung (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari dua gagasan yang diulang), akan tetapi pengulangan tersebut tidak mempengaruhi koherensi komposisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang kurang runtut pada pokok pikiran utama, serta ada beberapa pengulangan gagasan dalam kalimat pendukung (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari tiga gagasan yang diulang), sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan kurang menunjukkan koherensi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang tidak runtut pada pokok pikiran utama, serta banyak pengulangan gagasan dalam kalimat pendukung (misalnya: dengan lebih dari tiga gagasan yang diulang), sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan hampir tidak menunjukkan koherensi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang sama sekali tidak runtut baik pada pokok pikiran utama maupun kalimat pendukung dalam keseluruhan komposisi sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan tidak menunjukkan koherensi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cohesion

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi secara padu dengan ide-ide atau pokok pikiran yang saling berkaitan antar paragraf dan menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>padu</strong> dengan <strong>ide-ide atau pokok pikiran yang saling berkaitan erat</strong> antar kalimat atau paragraf dan menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>padu</strong> dengan terdapat sedikit sekali ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf yang <strong>kurang berkaitan</strong> dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari satu ide atau pokok pikiran) dan menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>cukup padu</strong> dengan terdapat beberapa ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf yang <strong>kurang berkaitan</strong> dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari dua ide atau pokok pikiran) dan <strong>sedikit kurang tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung</strong> (misalnya: terdapat tidak lebih dari tiga kesalahan dalam penggunaan kata ganti atau kata penghubung).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>kurang padu</strong> dengan terdapat banyak ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf yang <strong>kurang berkaitan</strong> dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tiga atau lebih ide atau pokok pikiran) dan <strong>kurang tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung</strong> (misalnya: terdapat lebih dari tiga kesalahan dalam penggunaan kata ganti atau kata penghubung).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara tidak padu dan hampir seluruh ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf tidak berkaitan dengan pokok pikiran utama sehingga kalimat atau paragraf terlihat seperti paragraf lepas serta tidak tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung.
D. Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

Kriteria: menggunakan banyak variasi kosa kata dalam pemilihan kata dan menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan dalam pemilihan kosa kata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang tepat dan sangat bervariasi</strong> sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi serta <strong>menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan</strong> dalam pemilihan kosa kata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang bervariasi</strong> sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi, <strong>menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan</strong> dalam pemilihan kosa kata dan <strong>terdapat sedikit kesalahan dalam pemilihan kata</strong>, <strong>tetapi tetap memadai</strong> dan tidak <strong>mengurangi makna dari isi komposisi</strong> yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang tepat tetapi kurang bervariasi</strong> dan kadang-kadang <strong>menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan</strong> dalam pemilihan kata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang jarang atau hampir tidak tepat</strong>, <strong>tidak ada variasi</strong> dan tidak <strong>menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan</strong> dalam pemilihan kata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang terbatas</strong> dan pemilihan kata yang <strong>tidak sesuai</strong> dengan topik dan judul komposisi sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan kurang jelas dan sulit dipahami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Grammar

Kriteria: menggunakan struktur gramatikal sederhana dan kompleks dengan benar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa tidak pernah membuat kesalahan gramatikal dalam mengembangkan komposisi, baik pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) maupun pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa sangat jarang membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, tetapi terdapat sedikit kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat), namun kesalahan tersebut tidak terlalu mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, tetapi cukup banyak membuat kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut baik pada struktur gramatikal dasar maupun stuktur gramatikal kompleks cukup mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa sering sekali membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, dan banyak sekali kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut baik pada struktur gramatikal dasar dan struktur gramatikal kompleks sangat mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa selalu membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada hampir seluruh struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dan struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut sangat mengganggu dalam pemahaman komposisi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Mechanical Accuracy I (Punctuation)

Kriteria: mengembangkan kompisisi dengan penggunaan tanda baca yang baik dan benar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa tidak pernah membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (&quot; &quot;), tanda titik dua (;), tanda titik koma (;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa jarang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa sedikit kurang dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (&quot; &quot;), tanda titik dua (;), tanda titik koma (;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya, akan tetapi makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut masih dapat disampaikan dengan baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa sering membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa kurang dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (&quot; &quot;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya sehingga makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut kurang dapat disampaikan dengan baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa hampir selalu membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa menggunakan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (&quot; &quot;), tanda titik dua (;), tanda titik koma (;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi secara tidak tepat sehingga makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut cenderung membingungkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa tidak memahami fungsi dari tiap-tiap tanda baca sehingga selalu membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaannya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi dengan penulisan kata yang tepat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan <strong>tidak pernah membuat kesalahan</strong> dalam penulisan kata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4 | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **jarang membuat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata**  
Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dengan tidak lebih dari 10 atau (1/9 bagian komposisi) dari keseluruhan jumlah kata dalam komposisi (± 90 kata), akan tetapi makna dari komposisi tersebut masih dapat dipahami dengan baik |
| 3 | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata dengan jumlah kesalahan tidak lebih dari 20 atau (2/9 bagian komposisi) dari keseluruhan jumlah kata dalam komposisi (± 90 kata), dan makna dari komposisi tersebut kurang dapat dipahami dengan baik |
| 2 | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **sering membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dengan tidak lebih dari 30 atau (3/9 bagian komposisi) dari keseluruhan jumlah kata dalam komposisi (± 90 kata), dan kesalahan tersebut cukup mengganggu dalam pemahaman komposisi |
| 1 | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **sering sekali membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dengan lebih dari 30 atau (lebih dari 1/3 bagian komposisi) dan kesalahan tersebut sangat mengganggu dalam pemahaman komposisi |
H. Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi dengan penggunaan huruf kapital yang tepat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan tidak pernah membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan jarang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
  Misalnya: terdapat sedikit kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 3    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
  Misalnya: terdapat beberapa kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 2    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan sering membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
  Misalnya: terdapat cukup banyak kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 1    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan sering sekali membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
  Misalnya: terdapat banyak kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
A. Relevance and Adequacy of Content

Criteria: developing a composition that relevant and adequate to the topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops the topic by <em>always using relevant and various expressions</em> (for instance: using three or more various expressions) and results the composition that has <em>close relevance and adequacy to the topic</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops the topic by <em>often using relevant and various expressions</em> (for instance: using three various expressions) and results the composition that <em>has quite relevance and adequacy to the topic</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops the topic by <em>sometimes using relevant and various expressions</em> (for instance: using two various expressions), and results the composition that <em>has quite relevance and adequacy to the topic</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops the topic by <em>using rarely or few relevant and various expressions</em> and results the composition that <em>does not quite have relevance and adequacy to the topic</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops the topic by <em>very rarely or never using various expressions</em> and results the composition that <em>almost does not have relevance and adequacy to the topic</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Compositional Organization

Criteria: developing a composition that has a coherent and orderly organization of idea and no repetition of it in the composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops the composition with a <strong>coherent and orderly (general-specific) organization of idea</strong> and there is <strong>no repetition</strong> of it in the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with an <strong>orderly (general-specific) organization of idea in the main sentences</strong>, and there is <strong>a few repetition of idea in supporting sentences</strong> (for instance: no more than two repeated idea), however the repetition does not influence the intent of the composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a <strong>less orderly organization of idea in the main sentences</strong>, and there is <strong>some repetition of idea in supporting sentences</strong> (for instance: no more than three repeated idea) so that the composition is <strong>less coherent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a <strong>disorderly organization of idea in the main sentences</strong>, and there is <strong>many repetition of idea in supporting sentences</strong> (for instance: more than three repeated idea) so that the composition is <strong>almost incoherent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a <strong>very disorderly organization of idea both in the main and supporting sentences</strong> so that the composition is <strong>incoherent</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cohesion

Criteria: Developing a composition cohesively with a close relationship of idea among paragraph and using pronoun and conjunction correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>cohesive composition</strong> with a close relationship of thought among sentences or paragraphs and <strong>uses pronoun and conjunction correctly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>cohesive composition</strong> and only few thought in sentences or paragraphs that less relate to the main idea (for instance: no more than one thought) and <strong>uses pronoun and conjunction correctly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>quite cohesive composition</strong> and there is some thought in sentences or paragraphs that less relate to the main idea (for instance: no more than two thought) and <strong>uses pronoun and conjunction less appropriately</strong> (for instance: no more than three mistakes in pronoun and conjunction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>less cohesive composition</strong> and there is many thought in sentences or paragraphs that less relate to the main idea (for instance: three or more thought) and <strong>uses pronoun and conjunction less appropriately</strong> (for instance: more than three mistakes in pronoun and conjunction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>non-cohesive composition</strong> and almost all of thought in sentences or paragraphs are unrelated to the main idea so that the sentences or paragraphs are independent and <strong>uses pronoun and conjunction less appropriately</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

Criteria: Using various vocabulary and indicating vocational competence in the choice of words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using appropriate and very various vocabulary according to the topic and title of the composition and generates vocational competence in the choice of words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using various vocabulary according to the topic and title of the composition, generates vocational competence in the choice of words with few mistakes, however the intent of the composition is adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using appropriate but less various vocabulary and sometimes generates vocational competence in the choice of words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by almost using inappropriate and no variation of vocabulary and does not generate vocational competence in the choice of words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using limited and inappropriate vocabulary so that the composition is difficult to comprehend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Grammar

Criteria: using basic and grammatical structures correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student <strong>never makes any grammatical mistakes</strong> in developing the composition, both <strong>in basic grammatical structures</strong> (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and <strong>in complex grammatical structures</strong> (such as complex sentences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student <strong>rarely makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures</strong> (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) in developing the composition and makes <strong>few mistakes in complex grammatical structures</strong> (such as complex sentences), however the mistakes do not impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student <strong>sometimes makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures</strong> (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) in developing the composition, and makes <strong>quite a lot mistakes in complex grammatical structures</strong> (such as complex sentences) and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures <strong>impede the meaning of the composition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student <strong>often makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures</strong> (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) in developing the composition, and makes <strong>so many mistakes in complex grammatical structures</strong> (such as complex sentences) and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures <strong>strongly impede the meaning of the composition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student <strong>so often makes grammatical mistakes in almost all basic grammatical structures</strong> (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and <strong>complex grammatical structures</strong> (such as complex sentences) and those mistakes are <strong>strongly disrupting in comprehending the composition</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Mechanical Accuracy I (Punctuation)

Criteria: developing a composition with the correct punctuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student <strong>never makes mistakes</strong> in the use of the punctuation. For instance: the student is able to use the punctuation such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuation appropriately in developing the composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student <strong>rarely makes mistakes</strong> in the use of the punctuation. For instance: the student is little bit less able to use the punctuation such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuation appropriately in developing the composition, however <strong>the meaning and intonation of the composition are not impeded</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student <strong>sometimes makes mistakes</strong> in the use of the punctuation. For instance: the student is less able to use the punctuation such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuation appropriately in developing the composition, therefore <strong>the meaning and intonation of the composition are slightly impeded</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student <strong>often makes mistakes</strong> in the use of the punctuation. For instance: the student inaccurately uses the punctuation such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuation in developing the composition, therefore <strong>the meaning and intonation of the composition are bemused</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student <strong>does not comprehend</strong> the function of the punctuation, therefore he or she <strong>so often makes mistakes</strong> in the use of the punctuation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)

Criteria: developing a composition with the correct spelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops the composition by <em>never making mistakes</em> in spelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4     | The student develops the composition by *rarely making mistakes* in spelling  
For instance: the mistakes are *not more than 10 or (1/9 part of composition)* of the total number of the words in the composition (± 90 words), however the meaning of the composition can be comprehended properly |
| 3     | The student develops the composition by *sometimes making mistakes* in spelling  
For instance: the mistakes are *not more than 20 or (2/9 part of composition)* of the total number of the words in the composition (± 90 words), and the meaning of the composition are *not quite well comprehended* |
| 2     | The student develops the composition by *often making mistakes* in spelling  
For instance: the mistakes are *not more than 30 or (3/9 part of composition)* of the total number of the words in the composition (± 90 words), and the mistakes are *quite impeding the composition comprehension* |
| 1     | The student develops the composition by *very often making mistakes* in spelling  
For instance: the mistakes are more than 30 or (1/3 part of composition) and the mistakes are *strongly impeding the composition comprehension* |
H. Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)

Criteria: developing a composition with the correct capitalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>never making mistakes</strong> in capitalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4     | The student develops a composition by **rarely making mistakes** in capitalization  
For instance: there is few mistakes by not capitalizing the initial sentences, the name of place, the name of person, the name of institution, the name of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
| 3     | The student develops a composition by **sometimes making mistakes** in capitalization  
For instance: there is some mistakes by not capitalizing the initial sentences, the name of place, the name of person, the name of institution, the name of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
| 2     | The student develops a composition by **often making mistakes** in capitalization  
For instance: there is quite a lot of mistakes by not capitalizing the initial sentences, the name of place, the name of person, the name of institution, the name of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
| 1     | The student develops a composition by **very often making mistakes** in capitalization  
For instance: there is many mistakes by not capitalizing the initial sentences, the name of place, the name of person, the name of institution, the name of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
APPENDIX H

THE RESULT OF THE THIRD VALIDATION OF THE RUBRIC

THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RUBRIC
(FOR THE PRELIMINARY FIELD TEST)
The Result of the Validation of An Analytical Rubric to Assess Vocational High School Students’ Writing Performances in the Preliminary Field Test

Third Validation: November 18th, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Aspects of Assessment</th>
<th>Result of Validation</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Relevance and adequacy of content             | - “Ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi”  
  Komposisi yang menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian tidak selalu menggunakan ungkapan yang relevan dan bervariasi yang relevan dan bervariasi merupakan bagian dari ungkapan bahasa bukan bagian dari relevansi  
  “Relevant and various expressions”  
  A relevant and adequate composition not always uses relevant and adequate expressions because those are part of language expression not a matter of relevance. | - Diperbaiki deskriptornya.  
  Revise the descriptor.                                                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Compositional organization</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Tepat artinya sudah menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan. Jadi kosakata yang tepat artinya yang kosakata yang mengarah ke kompetensi kejuruan.

Appropriate means generate vocational competence. Therefore, the appropriate vocabulary means those which are close to the vocational competence.

- Frasa “menunjukkan kompetensi kejuruan” dalam rubrik bisa dihilangkan.

- Jika teks nya berupa dialog, bagaimana jika hanya terdiri dari kalimat-kalimat yang pendek (misal: hanya terdiri dari satu kata)

If the text (composition) is in the form of dialogue, how if it only consists short sentences (e.g: only consist of a word)

- Bisa diantisipasi dengan pemberian perintah yang jelas bahwa dialognya harus benar-benar tanya jawab. Jangan hanya menjawab what, tetapi juga harus ada alasannya.

It can be anticipated by giving a clear command that the dialogue should be a question and answer. It is not only answering the question of what, but also completing it with the reason.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluator

Drs. Bambang Priyanto
A. Relevance and Adequacy of Content

Kriteria: mengembangkan isi komposisi yang memiliki hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi yang menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian yang erat dengan topik, dengan menggunakan kalimat pendukung yang berkaitan dengan kalimat utama, dan memberikan kesimpulan yang sesuai dengan topik dan komposisi yang dikembangkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi yang menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik, dengan menggunakan kalimat pendukung yang berkaitan dengan kalimat utama, tetapi memberikan kesimpulan yang kurang menunjukkan kesesuaian dengan topik dan komposisi yang dikembangkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi yang cukup menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik, tetapi ada beberapa kata, frasa, atau klausa dalam kalimat pendukung yang kurang berkaitan dengan kalimat utama, dan memberikan kesimpulan yang kurang menunjukkan kesesuaian dengan topik dan komposisi yang dikembangkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi yang kurang menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik, ada cukup banyak kata, frasa, atau klausa dalam kalimat pendukung yang kurang berkaitan dengan kalimat utama, dan memberikan kesimpulan yang hampir tidak menunjukkan kesesuaian dengan topik dan komposisi yang dikembangkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi yang kurang menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik, ada banyak kata, frasa, atau klausa dan kalimat pendukung yang kurang berkaitan dengan kalimat utama, dan memberikan kesimpulan yang tidak menunjukkan kesesuaian dengan topik dan komposisi yang dikembangkan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Compositional Organization

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi yang memiliki penataan ide yang koheren, runtut dan tidak ada pengulangan gagasan dalam keseluruhan komposisi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang koheren, runtut (umum-khusus), serta tidak ada pengulangan gagasan dalam keseluruhan komposisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang runtut (umum-khusus) pada pokok pikiran utama, serta ada sedikit pengulangan gagasan dalam kalimat pendukung (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari dua gagasan yang diulang), akan tetapi pengulangan tersebut tidak mempengaruhi koherensi komposisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang kurang runtut pada pokok pikiran utama, serta ada beberapa pengulangan gagasan dalam kalimat pendukung (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari tiga gagasan yang diulang), sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan kurang menunjukkan koherensi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang tidak runtut pada pokok pikiran utama, serta banyak pengulangan gagasan dalam kalimat pendukung (misalnya: dengan lebih dari tiga gagasan yang diulang), sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan hampir tidak menunjukkan koherensi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang sama sekali tidak runtut baik pada pokok pikiran utama maupun kalimat pendukung dalam keseluruhan komposisi sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan tidak menunjukkan koherensi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cohesion

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi secara padu dengan ide-ide atau pokok pikiran yang saling berkaitan antar paragraf dan menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>padu</strong> dengan <strong>ide-ide atau pokok pikiran yang saling berkaitan erat</strong> antar kalimat atau paragraf dan <strong>menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>padu</strong> dengan terdapat <strong>sedikit sekali ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf yang kurang berkaitan</strong> dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari satu ide atau pokok pikiran) dan <strong>menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>cukup padu</strong> dengan terdapat beberapa <strong>ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf yang kurang berkaitan</strong> dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari dua ide atau pokok pikiran) dan <strong>sedikit kurang tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung</strong> (misalnya: terdapat tidak lebih dari tiga kesalahan dalam penggunaan kata ganti atau kata penghubung).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>kurang padu</strong> dengan terdapat <strong>banyak ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf yang kurang berkaitan</strong> dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tiga atau lebih ide atau pokok pikiran) dan <strong>kurang tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung</strong> (misalnya: terdapat lebih dari tiga kesalahan dalam penggunaan kata ganti atau kata penghubung).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara <strong>tidak padu dan hampir seluruh ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf tidak berkaitan</strong> dengan pokok pikiran utama sehingga kalimat atau paragraf terlihat seperti paragraf lepas serta <strong>tidak tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

Kriteria: menggunakan kosa kata yang tepat dan bervariasi sesuai dengan topic dan judul komposisi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan kosa kata yang tepat dan sangat bervariasi sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan kosa kata yang tepat dan bervariasi sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi dan terdapat sedikit kesalahan dalam pemilihan kata, tetapi tetap memadai dan tidak mengurangi makna dari isi komposisi yang dihasilkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan kosa kata yang tepat sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi tetapi kurang bervariasi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan kosa kata yang kurang tepat dan tidak ada variasi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan kosa kata yang terbatas dan pemilihan kata yang tidak sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan kurang jelas dan sulit dipahami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Grammar

Kriteria: menggunakan struktur gramatikal sederhana dan kompleks dengan benar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa tidak pernah membuat kesalahan gramatikal dalam mengembangkan komposisi, baik pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) maupun pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa sangat jarang membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, tetapi terdapat sedikit kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat), namun kesalahan tersebut tidak terlalu mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, tetapi cukup banyak membuat kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut baik pada struktur gramatikal dasar maupun stuktur gramatikal kompleks cukup mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa sering sekali membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, dan banyak sekali kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut baik pada struktur gramatikal dasar dan struktur gramatikal kompleks sangat mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Siswa selalu membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada hampir seluruh struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dan struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut sangat mengganggu dalam pemahaman komposisi.
F. Mechanical Accuracy (Punctuation)

Kriteria: mengembangkan kompisisi dengan penggunaan tanda baca yang baik dan benar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa tidak pernah membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (“ ”), tanda titik dua (;), tanda titik koma (;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa jarang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa sedikit kurang dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (“ ”), tanda titik dua (;), tanda titik koma (;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya, akan tetapi makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut masih dapat disampaikan dengan baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa sering membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa kurang dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (“ ”) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya sehingga makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut kurang dapat disampaikan dengan baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa hampir selalu membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa menggunakan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (“ ”), tanda titik dua (;), tanda titik koma (;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi secara tidak tepat sehingga makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut cenderung membingungkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa tidak memahami fungsi dari tiap-tiap tanda baca sehingga selalu membuat kesalahan dalam penggunannya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi dengan penulisan kata yang tepat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan <strong>tidak pernah membuat kesalahan</strong> dalam penulisan kata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **jarang membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
    Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dengan tidak lebih dari 10 atau (1/9 bagian komposisi) dari keseluruhan jumlah kata dalam komposisi (± 90 kata), akan tetapi makna dari komposisi tersebut masih dapat dipahami dengan baik |
| 3    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
    Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata dengan jumlah kesalahan tidak lebih dari 20 atau (2/9 bagian komposisi) dari keseluruhan jumlah kata dalam komposisi (± 90 kata), dan makna dari komposisi tersebut kurang dapat dipahami dengan baik |
| 2    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **sering membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
    Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dengan tidak lebih dari 30 atau (3/9 bagian komposisi) dari keseluruhan jumlah kata dalam komposisi (± 90 kata), dan kesalahan tersebut cukup mengganggu dalam pemahaman komposisi |
| 1    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **sering sekali membuat kesalahan** dalam penulisan kata  
    Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dengan lebih dari 30 atau (lebih dari 1/3 bagian komposisi) dan kesalahan tersebut sangat mengganggu dalam pemahaman komposisi |
H. Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)

Kriteria: mengembangkan kompisisi dengan penggunaan huruf kapital yang tepat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan tidak pernah membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan jarang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: terdapat sedikit kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 3    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: terdapat beberapa kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 2    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan sering membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: terdapat cukup banyak kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 1    | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan sering sekali membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: terdapat banyak kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
A. Relevance and Adequacy of Content

Criteria: developing a composition that is relevant and adequate to the topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is close in relevance and adequacy to the topic by using the supporting sentences that are relevant to the main sentence, and generates an inference that is adequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is relevant and adequate to the topic by using the supporting sentences that are relevant to the main sentence, but generates an inference that is less adequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is quite relevant and adequate to the topic, however there are some words, phrases or clauses in the supporting sentences that are less relevant to the main sentence, and generates an inference that is less adequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is not quite relevant and adequate to the topic, there are quite a lot of words, phrases or clauses in the supporting sentences that are less relevant to the main sentence, and generates an inference that is almost inadequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is not quite relevant and adequate to the topic, there are a lot of words, phrases or clauses and supporting sentences that are less relevant to the main sentence, and generates an inference that is inadequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Compositional Organization

Criteria: developing a composition that has a coherent and orderly organization of idea and there is no repetition of the idea in the composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a <strong>coherent and orderly (general-specific or specific-general) organization of idea</strong> and there is <strong>no repetition</strong> of it in the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with an <strong>orderly (general-specific or specific-general) organization of idea in the main sentences</strong>, and there are <strong>a few repetitions of idea in the supporting sentences</strong> (for instance: no more than two repeated idea), however <strong>the repetitions do not influence the intent of the composition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a <strong>less orderly organization of idea in the main sentences</strong>, and there are <strong>some repetitions of idea in the supporting sentences</strong> (for instance: no more than three repeated idea) so that <strong>the composition is less coherent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a <strong>disorderly organization of idea in the main sentences</strong>, and there are <strong>many repetitions of idea in the supporting sentences</strong> (for instance: more than three repeated idea) so that <strong>the composition is almost incoherent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a <strong>very disorderly organization of idea both in the main and supporting sentences</strong> so that the composition is incoherent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cohesion

Criteria: Developing a cohesive composition with a close relationship of idea among paragraphs and using pronouns and conjunctions correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a cohesive composition with a close relationship of thoughts among sentences or paragraphs and uses pronouns and conjunctions correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a cohesive composition and there are only a few thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs that are less related to the main idea (for instance: no more than one thought) and uses pronouns and conjunctions correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a quite cohesive composition and there are some thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs that are less related to the main idea (for instance: no more than two thoughts) and uses pronouns and conjunctions that are less appropriate (for instance: no more than three mistakes in pronouns and conjunctions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a less cohesive composition and there are many thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs that are less related to the main idea (for instance: three or more thoughts) and uses pronouns and conjunctions that are less appropriate (for instance: more than three mistakes in pronouns and conjunctions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops an incohesive composition and almost all of thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs are unrelated to the main idea so that the sentences or paragraphs are independent and uses pronouns and conjunctions less appropriately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

Criteria: Using appropriate and various vocabulary according to the topic and title of the composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>using appropriate and very various vocabulary</strong> according to the topic of composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>using appropriate and various vocabulary</strong> according to the topic of composition; there are few mistakes in the choice of words, however the intent of the composition is adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>using appropriate but less various vocabulary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>using less appropriate and almost no variation of vocabulary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>using limited and inappropriate vocabulary</strong> so that the composition is <strong>difficult to comprehend</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Grammar

Criteria: Using basic and complex grammatical structures correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student never makes grammatical mistakes in the composition, both in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student rarely makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes few mistakes in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) in the composition, however the mistakes do not impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student sometimes makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes quite a lot of mistakes in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) in the composition and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student often makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes so many mistakes in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) in the composition and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures strongly impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student so often makes grammatical mistakes in almost all basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures strongly interfere in comprehending the composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Mechanical Accuracy I (Punctuation)

Criteria: developing a composition with the appropriate punctuations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | The student **never makes mistakes** in the use of punctuations  
For instance: the student is able to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition |
| 4     | The student **rarely makes mistakes** in the use of punctuations  
For instance: the student is little bit unable to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition, however **the meaning and the intonation of the composition are not impeded** |
| 3     | The student **sometimes makes mistakes** in the use of punctuations  
For instance: the student is less able to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition, therefore **the meaning and the intonation of the composition are slightly impeded** |
| 2     | The student **often makes mistakes** in the use of punctuations  
For instance: the student uses the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations inappropriately in the composition, therefore **the meaning and the intonation of the composition are bemused** |
| 1     | The student **does not comprehend** the function of punctuations, therefore he or she **makes mistakes so often** in the use of punctuations |
### G. Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)

Criteria: developing a composition with the correct spelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>never making mistakes</strong> in spelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4     | The student develops a composition by **rarely making mistakes** in spelling  
   For instance: the mistakes are **not more than 10** (or 1/9 part of composition) from the total number of the words in the composition (± 90 words), however the meaning of the composition can be **comprehended properly** |
| 3     | The student develops a composition by **sometimes making mistakes** in spelling  
   For instance: the mistakes are **not more than 20** (or 2/9 part of composition) from the total number of the words in the composition (± 90 words), and the meaning of the composition is **not quite well to comprehend** |
| 2     | The student develops a composition by **often making mistakes** in spelling  
   For instance: the mistakes are **not more than 30** (or 3/9 part of composition) from the total number of the words in the composition (± 90 words), and the mistakes are **quite impeding the composition** |
| 1     | The student develops a composition by **very often making mistakes** in spelling  
   For instance: the mistakes are more than 30 (or 1/3 part of composition) and the mistakes are **strongly impeding the composition** |
H. Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)

Criteria: developing a composition with the correct capitalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>never making mistakes</strong> in the use of capital letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>rarely making mistakes</strong> in the use of capital letters. For instance: there are few mistakes in the composition by not capitalizing the beginning of the sentences, the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>sometimes making mistakes</strong> in the use of capital letters. For instance: there are some mistakes in the composition by not capitalizing the beginning of the sentences, the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>often making mistakes</strong> in the use of capital letters. For instance: there are quite a lot of mistakes in the composition by not capitalizing the beginning of the sentences, the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>very often making mistakes</strong> in the use of capital letters. For instance: there are many mistakes in the composition by not capitalizing the beginning of the sentences, the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

THE RESULT OF THE EVALUATION IN THE TRYOUT
Evaluasi Guru dalam Uji Coba (Tryout) Analytical Rubric untuk Menilai Pekerjaan Menulis (Writing) Siswa SMK

Hari & Tanggal Evaluasi: Saturday, 26 February 2011  
Guru : Mrs. TM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pertanyaan</th>
<th>Jawaban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini mudah digunakan untuk mengevaluasi pekerjaan siswa (writing)?</td>
<td>Rubrik ini cukup membantu dalam evaluasi writing, tetapi penggunaannya memerlukan waktu yang cukup lama karena rubriknya sangat detail, sedangkan penilaian dari siswa tidak hanya dari writing saja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apakah aspek-aspek yang menjadi kriteria penilaian dalam rubrik ini dideskripsikan dengan jelas dan apa saran Ibu jika terdapat kekurangan dalam aspek tersebut?</td>
<td>Ya, aspek-aspek tersebut dideskripsikan dengan jelas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bagaimana pendapat Ibu mengenai skor dan deskriptor, apakah skor dan deskriptor tersebut sesuai dengan tingkat pencapaian yang diharapkan dari kemampuan siswa dalam menulis (writing)?</td>
<td>Menurut saya, skor dan deskriptor untuk tiap spek jangan sama. Kedelapan spek diurutkan sesuai dengan tingkat kepentingan, akan tetapi memiliki perbedaan dalam bobot. Misal: ada prosentase yang lebih besar untuk aspek yang dianggap lebih penting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini dapat digunakan untuk berbagai macam writing tasks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Menurut saya, rubrik ini bisa digunakan untuk berbagai macam writing tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Apa saja masalah/hambatan yang Ibu hadapi dalam pelaksanaan penilaian pekerjaan siswa (writing) menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rubriknya terlalu detail sehingga membutuhkan banyak waktu untuk mengoreksi pekerjaan siswa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bagaimanakah hasil penilaian writing siswa dengan menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Penilaian bisa lebih menyeluruh dari aspek-aspek writing. Untuk perbedaan dalam hal skor/angka, tidak terlalu signifikan karena kepahaman siswa dalam tiap-tiap task berbeda sehingga sangat mungkin menghasilkan skor yang berbeda. Dalam task ini, nilai siswa mungkin lebih murni karena didasarkan pada skor dan deskriptor yang ada sehingga nilai mereka benar-benar diukur dari ketelitian mereka dalam menulis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluasi Guru dalam Uji Coba (Tryout) *Analytical Rubric* untuk Menilai Pekerjaan Menulis (*Writing*) Siswa SMK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pertanyaan</th>
<th>Jawaban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini mudah digunakan untuk mengevaluasi pekerjaan siswa (<em>writing</em>)?</td>
<td>Menurut saya rubrik ini cukup mudah digunakan untuk mengevaluasi pekerjaan siswa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apakah aspek-aspek yang menjadi kriteria penilaian dalam rubrik ini dideskripsikan dengan jelas dan apa saran Ibu jika terdapat kekurangan dalam aspek tersebut?</td>
<td>Iya, hanya saja deskripsi dari beberapa aspek cukup panjang sehingga harus membaca berulang-ulang untuk mendapatkan point nya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bagaimana pendapat Ibu mengenai skor dan deskriptor, apakah skor dan deskriptor tersebut sesuai dengan tingkat pencapaian yang diharapkan dari kemampuan siswa dalam menulis (<em>writing</em>)?</td>
<td>Deskripsi cukup mewakili pencapaian yang diharapkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pertanyaan</td>
<td>Jawaban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini dapat digunakan untuk berbagai macam <em>Writing tasks</em>?S</td>
<td>Menurut saya rubrik ini dapat digunakan untuk berbagai macam writing tasks. Atau bisa diadaptasi jika memang ada yang kurang sesuai dengan needs tugas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Apa saja masalah/hambatan yang Ibu hadapi dalam pelaksanaan penilaian pekerjaan siswa (<em>writing</em>) menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat?</td>
<td>Hambatan hanya masalah waktu karena ada beberapa aspek yang dinilai jadi harus membaca berulang-ulang. Tetapi secara teknik penilaian tidak ada masalah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bagaimanakah hasil penilaian <em>writing</em> siswa dengan menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat?</td>
<td>Menurut saya, dengan menggunakan rubrik dalam menilai, kemampuan siswa lebih bisa dilihat dari tiap-tiap aspek, aspek apa saja yang sudah bagus dan aspek apa saja yang masih perlu untuk diperbaiki.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluasi Guru dalam Uji Coba (Tryout) *Analytical Rubric* untuk Menilai Pekerjaan Menulis (*Writing*) Siswa SMK

**Hari & Tanggal Evaluasi:** Saturday, 26 February 2011  
**Guru:** Mrs. NR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pertanyaan</th>
<th>Jawaban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini mudah digunakan untuk mengevaluasi pekerjaan siswa (<em>writing</em>)?</td>
<td>Ya, rubrik ini mudah digunakan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apakah aspek-aspek yang menjadi kriteria penilaian dalam rubrik ini dideskripsikan dengan jelas dan apa saran Ibu jika terdapat kekurangan dalam aspek tersebut?</td>
<td>Ya, aspek-aspek tersebut dideskripsikan dengan jelas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bagaimana pendapat Ibu mengenai skor dan deskriptor, apakah skor dan deskriptor tersebut sesuai dengan tingkat pencapaian yang diharapkan dari kemampuan siswa dalam menulis (<em>writing</em>)?</td>
<td>Menurut saya, skor dan deskriptor untuk tiap aspek sudah mencerminkan target yang harus dicapai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Apakah rubrik ini dapat digunakan untuk berbagai macam <em>Writing tasks</em>?</td>
<td>Rubrik ini bisa digunakan untuk berbagai macam <em>writing tasks</em>, tetapi mungkin deskriptor nya lebih dirampingkan saja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apa saja masalah/hambatan yang Ibu hadapi dalam pelaksanaan penilaian pekerjaan siswa (writing) menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dalam menilai pekerjaan siswa membutuhkan kejelian dan harus membaca berulang-ulang untuk setiap deskriptor skoringnya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bagaimanakah hasil penilaian writing siswa dengan menggunakan rubrik yang saya buat?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Keperluan penilaian dan evaluasi writing siswa bisa tercapai.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(The assessment and evaluation of students’ writing performances can be achieved.)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RUBRIC
**A. Relevance and Adequacy of Content**

Kriteria: mengembangkan isi komposisi yang memiliki hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor (x4)</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi yang <strong>menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian yang erat dengan topik</strong>, dengan menggunakan kalimat pendukung yang berkaitan dengan kalimat utama, dan memberikan kesimpulan yang sesuai dengan topik dan komposisi yang dikembangkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi yang <strong>menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik</strong>, dengan menggunakan kalimat pendukung yang berkaitan dengan kalimat utama, tetapi memberikan kesimpulan yang kurang menunjukkan kesesuaian dengan topik dan komposisi yang dikembangkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi yang <strong>cukup menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik</strong>, tetapi ada beberapa kata, frasa, atau klausa dalam kalimat pendukung yang kurang berkaitan dengan kalimat utama, dan memberikan kesimpulan yang kurang menunjukkan kesesuaian dengan topik dan komposisi yang dikembangkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi yang <strong>kurang menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik</strong>, ada cukup banyak kata, frasa, atau klausa dalam kalimat pendukung yang kurang berkaitan dengan kalimat utama, dan memberikan kesimpulan yang hampir tidak menunjukkan kesesuaian dengan topik dan komposisi yang dikembangkan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Siswa mengembangkan komposisi yang kurang menunjukkan hubungan dan kesesuaian dengan topik, ada banyak kata, frasa, atau klausa dan kalimat pendukung yang kurang berkaitan dengan kalimat utama, dan memberikan kesimpulan yang tidak menunjukkan kesesuaian dengan topik dan komposisi yang dikembangkan
B. Compositional Organization

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi yang memiliki penataan ide yang koheren, runtut dan tidak ada pengulangan gagasan dalam keseluruhan komposisi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor (x3)</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang koheren, runtut (umum-khusus), serta tidak ada pengulangan gagasan dalam keseluruhan komposisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang runtut (umum-khusus) pada pokok pikiran utama, serta ada sedikit pengulangan gagasan dalam kalimat pendukung (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari dua gagasan yang diulang), akan tetapi pengulangan tersebut tidak mempengaruhi koherensi komposisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang kurang runtut pada pokok pikiran utama, serta ada beberapa pengulangan gagasan dalam kalimat pendukung (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari tiga gagasan yang diulang), sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan kurang menunjukkan koherensi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang tidak runtut pada pokok pikiran utama, serta banyak pengulangan gagasan dalam kalimat pendukung (misalnya: dengan lebih dari tiga gagasan yang diulang), sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan hampir tidak menunjukkan koherensi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan penataan ide yang sama sekali tidak runtut baik pada pokok pikiran utama maupun kalimat pendukung dalam keseluruhan komposisi sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan tidak menunjukkan koherensi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cohesion

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi secara padu dengan ide-ide atau pokok pikiran yang saling berkaitan antar paragraf dan menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor (x4)</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara padu dengan ide-ide atau pokok pikiran yang saling berkaitan erat antar kalimat atau paragraf dan menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara padu dengan terdapat sedikit sekali ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf yang kurang berkaitan dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari satu ide atau pokok pikiran) dan menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung dengan tepat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara cukup padu dengan terdapat beberapa ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf yang kurang berkaitan dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tidak lebih dari dua ide atau pokok pikiran) dan sedikit kurang tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung (misalnya: terdapat tidak lebih dari tiga kesalahan dalam penggunaan kata ganti atau kata penghubung).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara kurang padu dengan terdapat banyak ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf yang kurang berkaitan dengan pokok pikiran utama (misalnya: dengan tiga atau lebih ide atau pokok pikiran) dan kurang tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung (misalnya: terdapat lebih dari tiga kesalahan dalam penggunaan kata ganti atau kata penghubung).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Siswa mengembangkan komposisi secara **tidak padu** dan **hampir seluruh ide-ide atau pokok pikiran dalam kalimat atau paragraf tidak berkaitan** dengan pokok pikiran utama sehingga kalimat atau paragraf terlihat seperti paragraf lepas serta **tidak tepat dalam menggunakan kata ganti dan kata penghubung**.
D. Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

Kriteria: menggunakan kosa kata yang tepat dan bervariasi sesuai dengan topic dan judul komposisi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor (x3)</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang tepat dan sangat bervariasi</strong> sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang tepat</strong> dan <strong>bervariasi</strong> sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi dan terdapat sedikit kesalahan dalam pemilihan kata, tetapi tetap memadai dan tidak mengurangi makna dari isi komposisi yang dihasilkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang tepat</strong> sesuai dengan topik dan judul komposisi <strong>tapi kurang bervariasi</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang kurang tepat</strong> dan <strong>tidak ada variasi</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan menggunakan <strong>kosa kata yang terbatas dan</strong> pemilihan kata yang <strong>tidak sesuai</strong> dengan topik dan judul komposisi sehingga komposisi yang dihasilkan kurang jelas dan sulit dipahami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Grammar

Kriteria: menggunakan struktur gramatikal sederhana dan kompleks dengan benar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor (x3)</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa tidak pernah membuat kesalahan gramatikal dalam mengembangkan komposisi, baik pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) maupun pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa sangat jarang membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, tetapi terdapat sedikit kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat), namun kesalahan tersebut tidak terlalu mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, tetapi cukup banyak membuat kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut baik pada struktur gramatikal dasar maupun stuktur gramatikal kompleks cukup mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa sering sekali membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dalam mengembangkan komposisi, dan banyak sekali kesalahan pada struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut baik pada struktur gramatikal dasar dan struktur gramatikal kompleks sangat mempengaruhi makna dari komposisi yang dihasilkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa selalu membuat kesalahan gramatikal pada hampir seluruh struktur gramatikal dasar (seperti frasa, kalimat sederhana dan kalimat majemuk setara) dan struktur gramatikal kompleks (seperti pada kalimat majemuk bertingkat) dan kesalahan tersebut sangat mengganggu dalam pemahaman komposisi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


F. Mechanical Accuracy (Punctuation)

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi dengan penggunaan tanda baca yang baik dan benar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor (x1)</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa tidak pernah membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (“ ”), tanda titik dua (:), tanda titik koma (;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa jarang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa sedikit kurang dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (“ ”), tanda titik dua (:), tanda titik koma (;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya, akan tetapi makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut masih dapat disampaikan dengan baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa sering membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa kurang dapat menempatkan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (“ ”) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi sesuai dengan fungsinya sehingga makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi tersebut kurang dapat disampaikan dengan baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa hampir selalu membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan tanda baca. Misalnya: siswa menggunakan tanda baca titik (.), koma (,), tanda tanya (?), tanda seru (!), tanda petik (“ ”), tanda titik dua (:), tanda titik koma (;) atau tanda baca lain yang digunakan dalam mengembangkan komposisi secara tidak tepat sehingga makna dan intonasi dalam komposisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siswa tidak memahami fungsi dari tiap-tiap tanda baca sehingga selalu membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaannya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*tersebut cenderung membingungkan*
G. Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi dengan penulisan kata yang tepat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor (x1)</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan tidak pernah membuat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4         | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan jarang membuat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata  
|           | Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata dengan tidak lebih dari 10 atau (1/9 bagian komposisi) dari keseluruhan jumlah kata dalam komposisi (± 90 kata), akan tetapi makna dari komposisi tersebut masih dapat dipahami dengan baik |
| 3         | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata  
|           | Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata dengan jumlah kesalahan tidak lebih dari 20 atau (2/9 bagian komposisi) dari keseluruhan jumlah kata dalam komposisi (± 90 kata), dan makna dari komposisi tersebut kurang dapat dipahami dengan baik |
| 2         | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan sering membuat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata  
|           | Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dengan tidak lebih dari 30 atau (3/9 bagian komposisi) dari keseluruhan jumlah kata dalam komposisi (± 90 kata), dan kesalahan tersebut cukup mengganggu dalam pemahaman komposisi |
| 1         | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan sering sekali membuat kesalahan dalam penulisan kata  
|           | Misalnya: terdapat kesalahan dengan lebih dari 30 atau (lebih dari 1/3 bagian komposisi) dan kesalahan tersebut sangat mengganggu dalam pemahaman komposisi |
H. Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)

Kriteria: mengembangkan komposisi dengan penggunaan huruf kapital yang tepat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor (x1)</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan <strong>tidak pernah membuat kesalahan</strong> dalam penggunaan huruf kapital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4         | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **Jarang membuat kesalahan** dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: terdapat sedikit kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 3         | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan** dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: terdapat beberapa kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 2         | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **sering membuat kesalahan** dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: terdapat cukup banyak kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital |
| 1         | Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan **sering sekali membuat kesalahan** dalam penggunaan huruf kapital  
Misalnya: terdapat banyak kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata
A. Relevance and Adequacy of Content

Criteria: developing a composition that is relevant and adequate to the topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x4)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is close in relevance and adequacy to the topic by using the supporting sentences that are relevant to the main sentence, and generates an inference that is adequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is relevant and adequate to the topic by using the supporting sentences that are relevant to the main sentence, but generates an inference that is less adequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is quite relevant and adequate to the topic, however there are some words, phrases or clauses in the supporting sentences that are less relevant to the main sentence, and generates an inference that is less adequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is not quite relevant and adequate to the topic, there are quite a lot of words, phrases or clauses in the supporting sentences that are less relevant to the main sentence, and generates an inference that is almost inadequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is not quite relevant and adequate to the topic, there are a lot of words, phrases or clauses and supporting sentences that are less relevant to the main sentence, and generates an inference that is inadequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Compositional Organization

Criteria: developing a composition that has a coherent and orderly organization of idea and there is no repetition of the idea in the composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x3)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a coherent and orderly (general-specific or specific-general) organization of idea and there is no repetition of it in the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with an orderly (general-specific or specific-general) organization of idea in the main sentences, and there are a few repetitions of idea in the supporting sentences (for instance: no more than two repeated idea), however the repetitions do not influence the intent of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a less orderly organization of idea in the main sentences, and there are some repetitions of idea in the supporting sentences (for instance: no more than three repeated idea) so that the composition is less coherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a disorderly organization of idea in the main sentences, and there are many repetitions of idea in the supporting sentences (for instance: more than three repeated idea) so that the composition is almost incoherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a very disorderly organization of idea both in the main and supporting sentences so that the composition is incoherent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cohesion

Criteria: Developing a cohesive composition with a close relationship of idea among paragraphs and using pronouns and conjunctions correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x4)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>cohesive composition</strong> with a close relationship of thoughts among sentences or paragraphs and uses pronouns and conjunctions correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>cohesive composition</strong> and there are only a few thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs that are less related to the main idea (for instance: no more than one thought) and uses pronouns and conjunctions correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>quite cohesive composition</strong> and there are some thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs that are less related to the main idea (for instance: no more than two thoughts) and uses pronouns and conjunctions that are less appropriate (for instance: no more than three mistakes in pronouns and conjunctions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a <strong>less cohesive composition</strong> and there are many thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs that are less related to the main idea (for instance: three or more thoughts) and uses pronouns and conjunctions that are less appropriate (for instance: more than three mistakes in pronouns and conjunctions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops an <strong>incohesive composition</strong> and almost all of thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs are unrelated to the main idea so that the sentences or paragraphs are independent and uses pronouns and conjunctions less appropriately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

Criteria: Using appropriate and various vocabulary according to the topic and title of the composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x3)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>appropriate and very various vocabulary</strong> according to the topic of composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>appropriate and various vocabulary</strong> according to the topic of composition; there are few mistakes in the choice of words, however the intent of the composition is adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>appropriate but less various vocabulary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>less appropriate and almost no variation of vocabulary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>limited and inappropriate vocabulary</strong> so that the composition is difficult to comprehend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Grammar

Criteria: Using basic and complex grammatical structures correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x3)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student never makes grammatical mistakes in the composition, both in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student rarely makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes few mistakes in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) in the composition, however the mistakes do not impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student sometimes makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes quite a lot of mistakes in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) in the composition and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student often makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes so many mistakes in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) in the composition and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures strongly impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student so often makes grammatical mistakes in almost all basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures strongly interfere in comprehending the composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Mechanical Accuracy I (Punctuation)

Criteria: developing a composition with the appropriate punctuations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x1)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student <strong>never makes mistakes</strong> in the use of punctuations For instance: the student is able to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student <strong>rarely makes mistakes</strong> in the use of punctuations For instance: the student is little bit unable to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition, however the meaning and the intonation of the composition are not impeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student <strong>sometimes makes mistakes</strong> in the use of punctuations For instance: the student is less able to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition, therefore the meaning and the intonation of the composition are slightly impeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student <strong>often makes mistakes</strong> in the use of punctuations For instance: the student uses the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations inappropriately in the composition, therefore the meaning and the intonation of the composition are bemused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student <strong>does not comprehend</strong> the function of punctuations, therefore he or she <strong>makes mistakes so often</strong> in the use of punctuations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)

Kriteria: mengembangkan kompisisi dengan penggunaan huruf kapital yang tepat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor (x1)</th>
<th>Deskriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan tidak pernah membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan jarang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital Misalnya: terdapat sedikit kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan kadang-kadang membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital Misalnya: terdapat beberapa kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan sering membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital Misalnya: terdapat cukup banyak kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siswa mengembangkan komposisi dengan sering sekali membuat kesalahan dalam penggunaan huruf kapital Misalnya: terdapat banyak kesalahan dengan siswa tidak menggunakan huruf kapital di awal kalimat dan selain di awal kalimat, seperti dalam penulisan nama tempat, nama orang, nama institusi, nama hari dan kata atau frasa yang seharusnya dituliskan dengan huruf kapital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Relevance and Adequacy of Content

Criteria: developing a composition that is relevant and adequate to the topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x4)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is close in relevance and adequacy to the topic by using the supporting sentences that are relevant to the main sentence, and generates an inference that is adequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is relevant and adequate to the topic by using the supporting sentences that are relevant to the main sentence, but generates an inference that is less adequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is quite relevant and adequate to the topic, however there are some words, phrases or clauses in the supporting sentences that are less relevant to the main sentence, and generates an inference that is less adequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is not quite relevant and adequate to the topic, there are quite a lot of words, phrases or clauses in the supporting sentences that are less relevant to the main sentence, and generates an inference that is almost inadequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition that is not quite relevant and adequate to the topic, there are a lot of words, phrases or clauses and supporting sentences that are less relevant to the main sentence, and generates an inference that is inadequate to the topic and composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Compositional Organization

Criteria: developing a composition that has a coherent and orderly organization of idea and there is no repetition of the idea in the composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x3)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a coherent and orderly (general-specific or specific-general) organization of idea and there is no repetition of it in the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with an orderly (general-specific or specific-general) organization of idea in the main sentences, and there are a few repetitions of idea in the supporting sentences (for instance: no more than two repeated idea), however the repetitions do not influence the intent of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a less orderly organization of idea in the main sentences, and there are some repetitions of idea in the supporting sentences (for instance: no more than three repeated idea) so that the composition is less coherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a disorderly organization of idea in the main sentences, and there are many repetitions of idea in the supporting sentences (for instance: more than three repeated idea) so that the composition is almost incoherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition with a very disorderly organization of idea both in the main and supporting sentences so that the composition is incoherent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cohesion

Criteria: Developing a cohesive composition with a close relationship of idea among paragraphs and using pronouns and conjunctions correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x4)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a cohesive composition with a close relationship of thoughts among sentences or paragraphs and uses pronouns and conjunctions correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a cohesive composition and there are only a few thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs that are less related to the main idea (for instance: no more than one thought) and uses pronouns and conjunctions correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a quite cohesive composition and there are some thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs that are less related to the main idea (for instance: no more than two thoughts) and uses pronouns and conjunctions that are less appropriate (for instance: no more than three mistakes in pronouns and conjunctions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a less cohesive composition and there are many thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs that are less related to the main idea (for instance: three or more thoughts) and uses pronouns and conjunctions that are less appropriate (for instance: more than three mistakes in pronouns and conjunctions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops an incohesive composition and almost all of thoughts in the sentences or paragraphs are unrelated to the main idea so that the sentences or paragraphs are independent and uses pronouns and conjunctions less appropriately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Adequacy of Vocabulary for Purpose

Criteria: Using appropriate and various vocabulary according to the topic and title of the composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x3)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>appropriate and very various vocabulary</strong> according to the topic of composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>appropriate and various vocabulary</strong> according to the topic of composition; there are <strong>few mistakes in the choice of words</strong>, however the <strong>intent of the composition is adequate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>appropriate but less various vocabulary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>less appropriate and almost no variation of vocabulary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by using <strong>limited and inappropriate vocabulary</strong> so that the composition is <strong>difficult to comprehend</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. Grammar

Criteria: Using basic and complex grammatical structures correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x3)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student never makes grammatical mistakes in the composition, both in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student rarely makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes few mistakes in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) in the composition, however the mistakes do not impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student sometimes makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes quite a lot of mistakes in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) in the composition and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student often makes grammatical mistakes in basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and makes so many mistakes in complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) in the composition and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures strongly impede the meaning of the composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student so often makes grammatical mistakes in almost all basic grammatical structures (such as phrases, simple and compound sentences) and complex grammatical structures (such as complex sentences) and the mistakes both in basic and complex structures strongly interfere in comprehending the composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### F. Mechanical Accuracy I (Punctuation)

Criteria: developing a composition with the appropriate punctuations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x1)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student <strong>never makes mistakes</strong> in the use of punctuations. For instance: the student is able to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student <strong>rarely makes mistakes</strong> in the use of punctuations. For instance: the student is little bit unable to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition, however the meaning and the intonation of the composition are not impeded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student <strong>sometimes makes mistakes</strong> in the use of punctuations. For instance: the student is less able to use the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations appropriately in the composition, therefore the meaning and the intonation of the composition are slightly impeded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student <strong>often makes mistakes</strong> in the use of punctuations. For instance: the student uses the punctuations such as a full stop (.), a comma (,), a question mark (?), an exclamation mark (!) or other punctuations inappropriately in the composition, therefore the meaning and the intonation of the composition are bemused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student <strong>does not comprehend</strong> the function of punctuations, therefore he or she <strong>makes mistakes so often</strong> in the use of punctuations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)

Criteria: developing a composition with the correct spelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x1)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>never making mistakes</strong> in spelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4          | The student develops a composition by **rarely making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: the mistakes are not more than 10 (or 1/9 part of composition) from the total number of the words in the composition (± 90 words), however the meaning of the composition can be comprehended properly |
| 3          | The student develops a composition by **sometimes making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: the mistakes are not more than 20 (or 2/9 part of composition) from the total number of the words in the composition (± 90 words), and the meaning of the composition is not quite well to comprehend |
| 2          | The student develops a composition by **often making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: the mistakes are not more than 30 (or 3/9 part of composition) from the total number of the words in the composition (± 90 words), and the mistakes are quite impeding the composition |
| 1          | The student develops a composition by **very often making mistakes** in spelling  
For instance: the mistakes are more than 30 (or 1/3 part of composition) and the mistakes are strongly impeding the composition |
**H. Mechanical Accuracy III (Capitalization)**

Criteria: developing a composition with the correct capitalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (x1)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The student develops a composition by <strong>never making mistakes</strong> in the use of capital letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4          | The student develops a composition by **rarely making mistakes** in the use of capital letters  
For instance: there are few mistakes in the composition by not capitalizing the beginning of the sentences, the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
| 3          | The student develops a composition by **sometimes making mistakes** in the use of capital letters  
For instance: there are some mistakes in the composition by not capitalizing the beginning of the sentences, the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
| 2          | The student develops a composition by **often making mistakes** in the use of capital letters  
For instance: there are quite a lot of mistakes in the composition by not capitalizing the beginning of the sentences, the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
| 1          | The student develops a composition by **very often making mistakes** in the use of capital letters  
For instance: there are many mistakes in the composition by not capitalizing the beginning of the sentences, the names of places, the names of people, the names of institutions, the names of the day, and words or phrases that should be capitalized |
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THE STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE IN THE TRYOUT
Visiting The Doctor

Last year I was sick and I went to see a doctor. I waited for the doctor to finish his examinations. He was a health specialist. He was an excellent doctor and his examinations were accurate. He listened to my heartbeat and checked my blood pressure and temperature. He also looked at my eyes and throat. He examined me accurately when he completed his examination, he said that my heart trouble was not a minor illness. He advised me to lose some weight, get plenty of sleep and eat nutritious meals. After giving my advice he wrote a press appointment. I felt better after I spoke to the doctor then went home and my mother went to the drug store to buy medicine. It was the first time I saw a specialist doctor.
Vacation end of the semester yesterday I and friends held a reunion SMP entitled "Reunion rancheria and Sobalony community of bandit lever one city". Reunion was conducted in a small shop on the coast of last and continued Pangungritus. Before reunion was carried out we and some friends had gathered at his home. Briefly after waiting some time and if friends are complete we immediately went to a shop called stall last. And there we ordered food and drinks. After the food was already gone Reunion then we proceeded on the beach Pangungritus. Incidentally there is hot weather. Nevertheless we still enjoyed it because there are very beautiful scenery. We were there also had to take pictures.

After our late afternoon and then finish it and go off home. Reunion respectively. We feel happy because reunion it running smoothly.

Nama = Mukhlis Amaludin
No = 24
Kelas = X Dkr B
One year ago, when I class third SMP, I and friends will follow for graduation. A few weeks before my home teacher, to learn in teacher. That is to learn English, matematik, IPA, B, Indonesia, when head to the teacher's house, we were wrong direction and we returned to find the right road. We to eight people, that is four people girls and four people boys. We visited 18:00.

When we go to, we buy food and we bought together at the of "ALTAR". When finished we took a break. We took a break we go home 21:30.

Aliyah Retuningrum
x DkV 13
Comparative Study on amikom and gajah mangkur.


First, I went in Amikom there I was shown about making movies and taught a few things. Me and friends invited to tour around in Amikom, we also photograph a picture together although her picture ugly ugly. After the amikom we go to waduk gajah mangkur there we walked the road.

Should that time we have rain logo contest photography but we did not race. There we were just not clear rain rain up to soaking wet.

Not after how many hours we pin back again to our school. Enough school we are at half eight in the evening. But while driving home one of our friends is seriously ill. At that time there were no hospitals after it we are looking are looking for and finally met and there we waited a very long time until the noisy friends. After we went home and went on my way home an finally we got to school at half past night.

First, I went in Amikom there I was shown about making movies and taught a few things. We were invited to tour around in Amikom.

We also photographed a picture together although her picture ugly. Ugly after the Amikom we went to Waduk Sajah Munakur there we walked the road. Should that time we here rain ago contest photography but we did not race...

My friends and still see the beautiful scenery. There also provides a boat to get around the town but the rain then not allowed to climb on a boat because of fear decree anything that does not want. After that we went home with a sense of excitement because they can get more knowledge.
In Jogjakarta, I very much like recreation. I like and happy live in Jogjakarta.

In Jogjakarta, every weekend, my friends and I go to the beach and play in the water. Beach activities are very fun and exciting. I have a lot of fun with my friends.

In Jogjakarta, the beaches are very beautiful. The sand is white and the sea water is clear. I love the beach and the sea.

In Jogjakarta, the streets are very crowded. Many people, especially students, go to the park to relax.

In Jogjakarta, the city is very beautiful. The buildings are modern and the roads are clean. I love living in Jogjakarta.
13.02.2011
Koriama tiara tunggal dewi
x oku b

I Miss U Grandma...

Every morning while grandmother was always a voice that is always just yell at me.
I know, grandma like that because of my mistake.
Bad habits up late, it makes angry grandmother.
However, I always did not want to be blamed.
Therefore, I am always looking for an excuse to avoid the angry grandmother.
This sense of longing that I feel every day, since the departure of grandmother for ever.
I feel very lonely and sad.
Was never heard again the voice of nagging grandmother.
I believe, someday I could meet again with the grandmother.
Do not forget every night I pray for him.
I miss u grandma.
My Birthday

yesterday was my birthday on 16th.
I'm very happy because I was already growing.

But while in school, I even did err on by my teachers and my friends.

I was embarrassed because I was told to come to the front of class by my teachers to do the problem that exist on the board.

At first, I could do it, but after a long time about it the more difficult and confusing.

Because I can not do it, then my teacher call Bagus, my friend to help me do about it, and we do it together.

I wanted to cry then, because I'm embarrassed.

Then, suddenly my teacher told Bagus to greet me and say "HAPPY BIRTHDAY", I smiled embarrassed and laughed with my friends.
Because of friend dating.

As Visual, all classmates also me already sat down neatly as the teacher entered into the class. Soon she were sticking something on posterboard, yes, it was a ton of tasks for remedial students. I tried to look carefully, only one finding. Out for anyone who will be the remedial victim and there's my name (how can you, put my name), remedial tasks that I would submit letter, it was tremendous project, something related with the shape and sketch.

And then for a long time, I finished this project. While I were submitting my project, the problem came. Mrs. Sisti wasn't at school. Recognize this. Some Mr. Lin came to me and said it would be better if I submitted the project tomorrow before 10 o'clock. As he said, I followed his suggestion and went to school. But before that, I passed by my friend's home. He just submitted his project by himself. When I got there, my my my... Enno still on her 3th project this made me so worried for a while, later we would be ready for school and sit on... And so the second item I passed by... I need to prepare for those who entrusted their task.
Uh... finally I reached my way to school and Mrs. S. was still busy for voting. We waited for her at Cameron. While waiting for Mrs. S. I said 'Oh my gosh.' I didn't realize that we met her by chance. On the way I went like a stupid who didn't feel for waiting my romantic film on live broadcast. Rather then choosing Mrs. S.'s home would be better place to wait. Since it was so near from the school.

While in Mrs. S.'s home, I went Eno and asked if the project already be submitted or not. Eno wasn't reply me. I was along line, already Eno replied but the sound from the televison already was too low and the project would have not submitted by me.

Oh my gosh, my score for project it wasn't submitted on the list of grade yet. The score it wasn't. In because of Mrs. S. was damn it be some like this. 😞
Last January 20th 2011, student of SMK 5 Yogyakarta visited to Waduk Gayah Mungkur to learn Industrial things located on Wonogiri. Due to the late of departing, the road is already crowded. Traffic jam is everywhere. Suddenly the weather become cloudy. As soon as we got there the hard rain come. So, we couldn't see the real dam was. We only saw it from the distance. By circling it. The bridge was flooded because of the rain. Time to go home. Now the bus was already there to pick up us all. On the way back home, one of my friends called Aziz was fainted because of his asthma. For a moment there were something to watch, we were sorry for Aziz, but he is alright now.

The visiting to Waduk Gayah Mungkur wasn't successful, but at least it is my experience.
My Experience

After the movie was over, I left the cinema quickly. My watch showed 11:30 p.m. as I got on to my motorcycle. I rode hard on my motorcycle and was soon speeding home.

My thoughts went back to the movie I had just seen. It was a scary story. I could remember clearly a woman screaming as she was being attacked by a monster. Somehow that frightful scene stayed in my mind and I could not forget.

The road was dark and quiet. I had to pass a graveyard on the way home. As I approached the graveyard, I heard some sound behind me. I was frightened and began to motorcycle faster. The sound came nearer and nearer. Then I heard a familiar voice calling me. I looked back and saw Andrea, my classmate. He had also seen the movie and was frightened too. He had motorcycled after me to make sure that he would not be alone. Both of us laughed out loud over our behavior.
My Story

On Sunday, I and my friends went to the beach. We went to beach by motorcycle. After on the beach I and my friends played sea water. But I played not long time sea water because my foot sick. I only saw my friends played and protect bag me and my friends. After all thirsty played we sat and played cards. Day is afternoon so we ready go home. On the way was we a motor cycle tube to leak. And we came to home at 07:00 p.m.
THE STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION
My Birthday

I was born on May 15th 1995. I'm twin. When my 15th birthday, me and my family moved from Klaten to Jogja. And at the moment, my twin and I were graduate from Junior High School 2 Klaten. As separated with our friends in Junior High School, my father celebrated my birthday party.

Not all of my friends can attended my birthday party, because at the moment was raining. I felt so happy at the moment although not all of my friends can attended my birthday party.

Next day, my friends and my twin's friend from the English Course (BPEC) from Klaten attended our birthday party. After we ate in my house, me, my twin, and our friends went to beach.

We felt so happy in there. We played water, and took some pictures. Suddenly, when we were taking a picture, my friends removed me and my twin to be water. All of our body was wet.
Yesterday at the moment I back from school, my gasoline is used up. I just have money two thousand rupees. Finally, I walked and pushed my motorcycle and till in my friend's home. I borrowed money to help. Moment I want buy gasoline, the keeper store said, "In the other, store, yeah! sis." How annoyed, where as I saw that gasoline in that stove. May be he thought I don't had money.

Finally I pushed my motorcycle then moment in that road any dog, I frighten to that dog and I prayed wish for that dog not chased me so far, I walked and finally I found with some one that sell gasoline and I can go home although until. So tired!
Last month, my friend and I went to a STEM lab Amikom University. We went to there for industry visit. I saw something. That is a man. The man was very handsome. His name is Dwindy Stanza. Inside the Amikom, we got a good lesson. When we were in there, we took photos. Before we went, suddenly one of my friends pulled me. Then, she asked me to take photo with Dwindy Stanza. I felt so happy at that moment. A long the trip, I saw again my photo with him. I want that be my profile picture in the future.

But that is just in my dream. Because this photos already deleted with my friend. Just got my photos, but all the photos in the camera. I felt sad because of that, until now.
Justin Bieber in Joyce

Last month, my best friends, Reso and Galuh and I, myself, went to Pizza Hut for eat and reunify. In the Pizza Hut, I met people like "Justin Bieber." My friend, Galuh, said, "He is very funny." She told me and Reso, her said, "Look, Joyce has new Justin Bieber," and I'm has laugh and hard with me and Reso.

"I'm sorry, are you blind? Galuh? Look at me. I'm more handsome than him," said Reso. "Yeah, you pretty boy," I said. We have fun in that place. I never forget this memory. I loved my best friend.
About My Feelings

Last night, I was feeling restless and uneasy, but I do not know what made me restless and uneasy. I try to look for entertainment, but it does not make me feel calm. I try to ask someone, but she did not answer. I feel more and more agitated. After I thought, it turns out tomorrow is the task of making English the story using the past. And finally I make stories like this.
Special Day

1st December 2010, my family and I went to Lampung to visit my sister.

4th December 2010, I came back to Soppa. On the night, my friends and I go to Eva's house to celebrate birthday.

On the morning, 5th December 2010, I sent SMS to my friends. I said "happy sunday :)". My friend, ender, he asked "why always failed for sent messages?". I explained all to him.

And then he say to me "do you want to be my girlfriend?" and I answered "yes". Since at the moment--- till now.

I always love Ender.
A month ago I and my friends went to Alun-alun to cycling on Sunday morning. We went to Ngarai Tamaradari park and then went to kraton Yogyakarta.

In the Alun-alun we make a picture together with camera phone, then we came back to home at 10 o'clock. So happy the time, I am so tired but I am happy.

Muhammad Arifin
25.6. x 2020
Last week, I and my friends wanted to play football. But before we played it, we called other friends together. After called other friends, then we went to yard... After that, we played as the world player, I.

In the match, I made 4 goals on one and football is quicker, 1 goal if I made after ran.

Kicked, provoked the ball, and passed to my friend (team).

After we felt the our power is lost... the football is finished, and my team won the game with score 5-3.

I and my friends went to our home together.
Our Promise

Place that I fake for this story is Bali, I lived in there for three years. That's a Cloudy day.

When I joined a Big Party there. I met a man who made the party is, my brother is friend. She's so kind and talented. It's same like his son. She and all of her team. Make a "Kuta Karnival" although the name is "Kuta". But the location is "66 (double six)" beach. In there, I joined some "Con Test", one of them is "Drafting Contest". We, I, and the other child, drawing in a Big Paper in stage. My friend, Marlen, draw a dragon and then he was lion that contest. For your information, he's not from Indonesia but Sweden. I'm lucky that he can speak English and Indonesia because he half of the time enjoy the life spend our time with him, played in jungle gym, make a sandcastle or just ran in the beach. All of us so sad that maybe we can't meet again then we must separated. But I trust we will meet again that's he said to me then. "How in Oo! We will meet again," so year. I said that was I said. "I swear" he answered my Promise. And in the to go home, I'm over sleep. Dreamed day, I and him met again.
My First Shipped

Last year I spent my long holiday abroad. I went there by ship. My Father and My Mother saw me off at the harbor. We arrived there thirty minutes before the departure time.

Arriving at the harbor, I went straight to the check in counter. After waiting for about twenty minutes, the ship was ready to depart so all passengers had to get into the ship.

Suddenly the ship began to shake in left and right. I'm became whirligig, but I'm happy. It was my first shipped but enjoyed.

Arda Aulia Bangsa
7 Animasi
04
I WENT TO SLEEP

My friend and I went to Sukfort last week. I invited
by one of my friends when we were home. School Finish
after 3 p.m. We went to Sukfort to try some new places.

We met in front of my friend's house. I tried to
stopped by some guy, who seemed

Initially we felt slightly scared. Later I even

my friend made a picture of us because I wish to use

After my picture taken, because they liked it, I remembered

enjoy my time out at home. When sitting here

in the reality, he told me because was impossible. Finally, I went to

sleep.
APPENDIX L

THE SCORE OF THE STUDENTS’ WRITING PERFORMANCE IN THE TRYOUT AND IMPLEMENTATION
THE RESULT OF STUDENTS' WRITING ASSESSMENT
TRY OUT
TASK: TELLING PAST EXPERIENCE
Class : X DKV B
SMK NEGERI 5 YOGYAKARTA

Rater : Ingrita Dewi Puspasari (Researcher) February 19th , 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relevance and adequacy of content</th>
<th>Compositional organization</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aisyah Restu N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ajeng Sugesti R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Antoni</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anom Uristyan P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ayu Kharismawati</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beldamerian A G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bintang Merah K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eno</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fery Ardhy Yanto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Galuh Adem K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gery Fardika C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I Wayan Bayu W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ibnu Darmawan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Indah Alam P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Indonmas S.S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Krisma Ardhiastuti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Maryam Tri</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Meyka Wulandari</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mukhlas Jamaludin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanicall accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nur Aktafiyani Gusriyana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rangga P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Riana A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rosiana Tiara Tunggal D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Septa Dewangga M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sulis Triyani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Talitha Dwi R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Titi Deviana A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tri Hernawan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Wahyu Andang Putra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wahyu Sekar Pamungkas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## THE RESULT OF STUDENTS' WRITING ASSESSMENT

**TRY OUT**

**TASK: TELLING PAST EXPERIENCE**

**Class : X DKV B**

**SMK NEGERI 5 YOGYAKARTA**

**Rater : Mrs. TM (Teacher I) February 19th, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Assessment Aspects</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compositional organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aisyah Restu N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ajeng Sugesti R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Antoni</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anom Uristyan P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ayu Kharismawati</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beldamerian A G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bintang Merah K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevancy and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eno</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fery Ardhy Yanto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Galuh Adem K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gery Fardika C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I Wayan Bayu W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ibnu Darmawan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Indah Alam P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Indonmas S.S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Krisma Ardhiastuti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Maryam Tri</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Meyka Wulandari</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mukhlas Jamaludin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nur Aktafiyani Gusriyana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rangga P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Riana A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rosiana Tiara Tunggal D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Septa Dewangga M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sulis Triyani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Talitha Dwi R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Titi Deviana A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tri Hemawan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Wahyu Andang Putra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wahyu Sekar Pamungkas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE RESULT OF STUDENTS' WRITING ASSESSMENT
### TRY OUT
### TASK: TELLING PAST EXPERIENCE
### Class : X DKV B
### SMK NEGERI 5 YOGYAKARTA

Rater : Mrs. ABS (Teacher II)  
February 19th, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relevance and adequacy of content</th>
<th>Compositional organization</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aisyah Restu N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ajeng Sugesti R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Antoni</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anom Uristyan P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ayu Kharismawati</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beldamerian A G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bintang Merah K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eno</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fery Ardhy Yanto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Galuh Adem K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gery Fardika C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I Wayan Bayu W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ibnu Darmawan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Indah Alam P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Indonmas S.S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Krisma Ardhiastuti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Maryam Tri</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Meyka Wulandari</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mukhlas Jamaludin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Assessment Aspects</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nur Aktafiyani Gusriyana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rangga P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Riana A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rosiana Tiara Tunggal D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Septa Dewangga M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sulis Triyani</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Talitha Dwi R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Titi Deviana A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tri Hernawan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Wahyu Andang Putra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wahyu Sekar Pamungkas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE RESULT OF STUDENTS' WRITING ASSESSMENT
TRY OUT
TASK: TELLING PAST EXPERIENCE
Class : X DKV B
SMK NEGERI 5 YOGYAKARTA

Rater : Mrs. NR (Teacher 3) February 19th, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relevance and adequacy of content</th>
<th>Compositional organization</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aisyah Restu N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ajeng Sugesti R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Antoni</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anom Uristyan P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ayu Kharismawati</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beldamerian A G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bintang Merah K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eno</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fery Ardhy Yanto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Galuh Adem K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gery Fardika C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I Wayan Bayu W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ibnu Darmawan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Indah Alam P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Indonmas S.S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Krisma Ardhiastuti</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Maryam Tri</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Meyka Wulandari</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mukhlas Jamaludin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nur Aktafiyanagi Gusriyana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rangga P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Riana A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rosiana Tiara Tunggal D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Septa Dewangga M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sulis Triyani</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Talitha Dwi R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Titi Deviana A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tri Hernawan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Wahyu Andang Putra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wahyu Sekar Pamungkas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Summary of the Raters' Score in the Students' Writing Performance in the Tryout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Researcher Total Score</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Teacher I Total Score</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Teacher II Total Score</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Teacher III Total Score</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Teacher I</th>
<th>Teacher II</th>
<th>Teacher III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>7.0833</td>
<td>6.8833</td>
<td>7.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>1.21651</td>
<td>1.13094</td>
<td>1.19325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE RESULT OF STUDENTS' WRITING ASSESSMENT
IMPLEMENTATION
TASK: TELLING PAST EXPERIENCE
Class : X ANIMASI
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Author : Ingrita Dewi Puspasari (Researcher) April 8th, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relevance and adequacy of content</th>
<th>Compositional Organization</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Americilrs</td>
<td>5 x 4</td>
<td>20 x 1</td>
<td>5 x 3</td>
<td>15 x 1</td>
<td>5 x 4</td>
<td>20 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 3</td>
<td>12 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>9 x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aninriyoga D.P</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>8 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 3</td>
<td>9 x 1</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>8 x 1</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>6 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>9 x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arda Aulia Bangsa</td>
<td>5 x 4</td>
<td>20 x 1</td>
<td>5 x 3</td>
<td>15 x 1</td>
<td>5 x 4</td>
<td>20 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 3</td>
<td>12 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Damar Ardy Sanjaya</td>
<td>1 x 4</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>1 x 3</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>1 x 4</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>1 x 3</td>
<td>2 x 1</td>
<td>6 x 1</td>
<td>2 x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Caesarka</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>8 x 1</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>6 x 1</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>8 x 1</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>6 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>9 x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional Organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dina Octaviani</td>
<td>5 20</td>
<td>5 15</td>
<td>4 16</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ditya Atmaja</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ervanto Prasetyo</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eva S</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 16</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fatih Oktika</td>
<td>4 16</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>5 20</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Giyatni</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hasbi Nur Dwi</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 16</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jefri Alfiantino</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Khorunisa Rizqi</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kristiawan BD.S</td>
<td>4 16</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 16</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional Organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Muhammad Anfaza R.B</td>
<td>4 x 4 16</td>
<td>4 x 3 12</td>
<td>3 x 4</td>
<td>3 x 3</td>
<td>3 x 9</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Oktabrian England I</td>
<td>2 x 4 8</td>
<td>2 x 3 6</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>3 x 3</td>
<td>3 x 9</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Risna Fitri</td>
<td>2 x 4 8</td>
<td>2 x 3 6</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>3 x 3</td>
<td>3 x 9</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rio Septian</td>
<td>4 x 4 16</td>
<td>4 x 3 12</td>
<td>4 x 4</td>
<td>3 x 3</td>
<td>3 x 9</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Robbystia</td>
<td>1 x 4 2</td>
<td>2 x 3 6</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tifyan Wisnu</td>
<td>2 x 4 8</td>
<td>2 x 3 6</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>2 x 1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tri Yulianto</td>
<td>2 x 4 8</td>
<td>2 x 3 6</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Yoga Andi S</td>
<td>2 x 4 8</td>
<td>2 x 3 6</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yuni Ratna</td>
<td>4 x 4 16</td>
<td>4 x 3 12</td>
<td>4 x 4</td>
<td>3 x 3</td>
<td>3 x 9</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional Organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yusuf Santosa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wahyu Garbo P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Wanda P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Winarti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Zasno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IMPLEMENTATION
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Rater: Mrs. TM (Teacher 1)  
April 8th, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relevance and adequacy of content</th>
<th>Compositional Organization</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Americils</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anintriyoga D.P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arda Aulia Bangsa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Damar Ardy Sanjoyo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Caesaraksa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional Organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dina Octaviani</td>
<td>4 16 4 12</td>
<td>4 16 4 12</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ditya Atmaja</td>
<td>3 12 3 9</td>
<td>2 8 2 6</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ervanto Prasetyo</td>
<td>3 12 3 9</td>
<td>2 8 3 9</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 3 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eva S</td>
<td>2 8 3 9</td>
<td>3 12 3 9</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 3 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fatih Oktika</td>
<td>4 16 4 12</td>
<td>4 16 4 12</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Giyatni</td>
<td>3 12 3 9</td>
<td>3 12 3 9</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 3 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hasbi Nur Dwi</td>
<td>3 12 4 12</td>
<td>3 12 3 9</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 3 5</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jefri Alfiantino</td>
<td>1 4 1 3</td>
<td>1 4 1 3</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 2 4</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Khorunisa Rizqi</td>
<td>2 8 2 6</td>
<td>2 8 2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kristiawan BD.S</td>
<td>4 16 4 12</td>
<td>3 12 3 9</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional Organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Muhammad Anfaza R.B</td>
<td>3 12 3 9</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Oktabrian England I</td>
<td>2 8 2 6</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Risna Fitri</td>
<td>2 8 2 6</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rio Septian</td>
<td>4 16 4 12</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Robbystia</td>
<td>2 8 2 6</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tifyan Wisnu</td>
<td>2 8 2 6</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tri Yulianto</td>
<td>2 8 2 6</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Yoga Andi S</td>
<td>2 8 3 9</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yuni Ratna</td>
<td>3 12 3 9</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional Organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wahyu Garbo P</td>
<td>1 4 1 3 1 4 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3</td>
<td>1 4 1 3 1 4 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3</td>
<td>1 4 1 3 1 4 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3</td>
<td>1 4 1 3 1 4 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Winarti</td>
<td>3 12 3 9 3 12 2 6 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9</td>
<td>3 12 3 9 3 12 2 6 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9</td>
<td>3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9</td>
<td>4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE RESULT OF STUDENTS' WRITING ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION
### TASK: TELLING PAST EXPERIENCE
### Class: X ANIMASI
### SMK NEGERI 5 YOGYAKARTA

**Rater**: Mrs. ABS (Teacher 2)  
**Date**: April 8th, 2011

#### Assessment Aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relevance and adequacy of content</th>
<th>Compositional Organization</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Americilrs</td>
<td>5 x4 20 4 x3 12</td>
<td>4 x4 16 4 x3 12</td>
<td>3 x3 9</td>
<td>4 x1 4 4 x1 4</td>
<td>2 x1 2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anintriyoga D.P</td>
<td>2 x2 8 2 x2 6</td>
<td>2 x2 8 3 x9</td>
<td>3 x9 4</td>
<td>4 x1 4 4 x1 4</td>
<td>3 x1 3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arda Aulia Bangsa</td>
<td>5 x2 20 5 x15</td>
<td>4 x16 5 x15</td>
<td>4 x12 4</td>
<td>4 x1 4 4 x1 4</td>
<td>4 x1 4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Damar Ardy Sanjoyo</td>
<td>1 x1 4 1 x3</td>
<td>1 x1 4 2 x6</td>
<td>2 x6 2</td>
<td>2 x2 2 2 x2 2</td>
<td>2 x2 2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Caesarakaka</td>
<td>2 x2 8 2 x9</td>
<td>2 x8 3 x9</td>
<td>3 x9 3</td>
<td>3 x3 3 3 x3 4</td>
<td>4 x4 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional Organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dina Octaviani</td>
<td>5, 20, 4, 12</td>
<td>4, 16, 4, 12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ditya Atmaja</td>
<td>3, 12, 3, 9</td>
<td>2, 8, 3, 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ervanto Prasetyo</td>
<td>3, 12, 3, 9</td>
<td>2, 8, 2, 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eva S</td>
<td>2, 8, 3, 9</td>
<td>3, 12, 3, 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fatih Oktika</td>
<td>5, 20, 4, 12</td>
<td>5, 20, 4, 12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Giyatni</td>
<td>3, 12, 3, 9</td>
<td>3, 12, 3, 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hasbi Nur Dwi</td>
<td>3, 12, 4, 12</td>
<td>4, 16, 3, 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jefri Alfiantino</td>
<td>1, 4, 1, 3</td>
<td>1, 4, 2, 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Khorunisa Rizqi</td>
<td>2, 8, 2, 6</td>
<td>2, 8, 2, 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kristiawan B.D.S.</td>
<td>4, 16, 4, 12</td>
<td>4, 16, 4, 12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Assessment Aspects</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Muhammad Anfaza R.B</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Oktabrian England I</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Risna Fitri</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rio Septian</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Robbystia</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tifyan Wisnu</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tri Yulianto</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Yoga Andi S</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yuni Ratna</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional Organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yusuf Santosa</td>
<td>2 8 2 6 2 8 2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wahyu Garbo P</td>
<td>1 4 1 3 1 3 1 3</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Wanda P</td>
<td>5 20 4 12 4 16 4 12 4 12</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Winarti</td>
<td>3 12 4 12 3 12 2 6 3 9 3 3 4 4 3 3</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Zasno</td>
<td>2 8 2 6 2 8 2 6 2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE RESULT OF STUDENTS’ WRITING ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION
TASK: TELLING PAST EXPERIENCE
Class : X ANIMASI
SMK NEGERI 5 YOGYAKARTA

Rater : Mrs. NR (Teacher 3)  April 8th, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relevance and adequacy of content</th>
<th>Compositional Organization</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</th>
<th>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Americilrs</td>
<td>4 16</td>
<td>5 15</td>
<td>4 16</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arintriyoga D.P</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arda Aulia Bangsa</td>
<td>5 20</td>
<td>5 15</td>
<td>4 16</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Damar Ardy Sanjoyo</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Caesaraaka</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Assessment Aspects</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content&lt;br&gt;Compositional Organization&lt;br&gt;Cohesion&lt;br&gt;Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose&lt;br&gt;Grammar&lt;br&gt;Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)&lt;br&gt;Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)&lt;br&gt;Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dina Octaviani</td>
<td>5 20 5 15 5 20 4 12 4 12 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 91</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ditya Atmaja</td>
<td>3 12 3 9 2 8 2 6 2 6 4 4 5 5 4 4 54</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ervanto Prasetyo</td>
<td>3 12 3 9 2 8 2 6 2 6 4 4 4 4 4 4 53</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eva S</td>
<td>3 12 4 12 4 16 3 9 3 9 3 3 4 4 4 4 69</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fatih Oktika</td>
<td>4 16 5 15 5 20 4 12 3 9 4 4 4 4 4 4 84</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Giyatni</td>
<td>3 12 3 9 3 12 3 9 3 9 3 3 4 4 5 5 63</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hasbi Nur Dwi</td>
<td>3 12 4 12 3 12 3 9 3 9 4 4 4 4 3 3 65</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jefri Alfiantino</td>
<td>1 4 1 3 1 4 2 6 2 6 3 3 4 4 2 2 32</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Khorunisa Rizqi</td>
<td>2 8 2 6 2 8 2 6 1 3 3 3 4 4 3 3 41</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kristiawan BD.S</td>
<td>4 16 4 12 3 12 3 9 4 12 4 4 4 4 4 4 73</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional Organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Muhammad Anfaza R.B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Oktabrian England I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Risna Fitri</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rio Septian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Robbystia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tifyan Wisnu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tri Yulianto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Yoga Andi S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yuni Ratna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relevance and adequacy of content</td>
<td>Compositional Organization</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy I (punctuation)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy II (spelling)</td>
<td>Mechanical accuracy III (capitalization)</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yusuf Santosa</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>2 x 4</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>2 x 1</td>
<td>2 x 1</td>
<td>2 x 1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wahyu Garbo P</td>
<td>1 x 1</td>
<td>1 x 1</td>
<td>1 x 1</td>
<td>1 x 1</td>
<td>1 x 1</td>
<td>1 x 1</td>
<td>1 x 1</td>
<td>1 x 1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Wanda P</td>
<td>5 x 4</td>
<td>5 x 3</td>
<td>4 x 2</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Winarti</td>
<td>3 x 2</td>
<td>3 x 2</td>
<td>3 x 2</td>
<td>3 x 2</td>
<td>3 x 2</td>
<td>3 x 2</td>
<td>3 x 2</td>
<td>3 x 2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Zasno</td>
<td>2 x 2</td>
<td>2 x 2</td>
<td>2 x 2</td>
<td>2 x 2</td>
<td>2 x 2</td>
<td>2 x 2</td>
<td>2 x 2</td>
<td>2 x 2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Summary of the Raters’ Score in the Students’ Writing Performance in the Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Teacher I</th>
<th>Teacher II</th>
<th>Teacher III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Teacher I</th>
<th>Teacher II</th>
<th>Teacher III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>57.0690</td>
<td>55.7241</td>
<td>57.2069</td>
<td>57.2069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>19.19995</td>
<td>17.11911</td>
<td>18.66697</td>
<td>18.13320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M

* COMPUTATION
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>7.0333</td>
<td>1.24349</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher1</td>
<td>6.8750</td>
<td>1.14046</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher2</td>
<td>7.1917</td>
<td>1.27422</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher3</td>
<td>6.9917</td>
<td>.93653</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Teacher1</th>
<th>Teacher2</th>
<th>Teacher3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.967**</td>
<td>.964**</td>
<td>.902**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

**COMPUTATION OF THE SCORES IN THE TRYOUT**
## Correlations

### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>57.7931</td>
<td>19.33424</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher1</td>
<td>55.8276</td>
<td>17.28556</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher2</td>
<td>57.5862</td>
<td>18.61934</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher3</td>
<td>57.4483</td>
<td>18.69795</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Teacher1</th>
<th>Teacher2</th>
<th>Teacher3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.987**</td>
<td>.980**</td>
<td>.973**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher1</td>
<td>.987**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.981**</td>
<td>.966**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher2</td>
<td>.980**</td>
<td>.981**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.973**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher3</td>
<td>.973**</td>
<td>.966**</td>
<td>.973**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**COMPUTATION OF THE SCORES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION**
APPENDIX N

* RESEARCH SCHEDULE
## THE SCHEDULE OF THE RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing a research proposal</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Need analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining an Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing the first draft of the rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting the first draft to the expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising the first draft and writing the second draft of the rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting the second draft to the expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising the second draft and writing the third draft of the rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting the letter of permission to conduct the research from the Province</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting the third draft to the expert</td>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising the third draft and writing the final draft of the rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting the letter of permission to conduct the research from the school</td>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting the try out</td>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the try out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising the rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting the implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for Completed Research Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Acceptance of the Validation of an Analytical Rubric to Assess Vocational High School Students' Writing Performances in the Preliminary Field Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Date of Validation</th>
<th>Aspects of Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance and Adequacy of Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>First Validation (November 1st, 2010)</td>
<td>revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Second Validation (November 3rd, 2010)</td>
<td>revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third Validation (November 18th, 2010)</td>
<td>revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fourth Validation (November 25th, 2010)</td>
<td>revised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= revised

= accepted
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Untuk dapat terlaksananya maksud tersebut kami mohon izin dan bantuan sepihnya.

Atas izin dan kerjasamannya disampaikan terima kasih.

a.n. Dekan
Pembantu Dekan I,

Drs. Suhaini M. Saleh, M.A.
NIP. 19540120 197903 1 002
PEMERINTAH PROVINSI DAERAH ISTIMEWA YOGYAKARTA
SEKRETARIAT DAERAH
Kompleks Kepatihan, Danurejan, Telepon (0274) 562811 - 562814, 512243 (Hunting)
YOGYAKARTA 55213

SURAT KETERANGAN / IJIN

Perihal: Ijin Penelitian.

Membaca Surat: Dekan Fak Bahasa dan seni UNY.

Tanggal Surat: 29 OKTOBER 2010.

Mengingat:

DILJINKAN untuk melakukan kegiatan survei/penelitian/pendataan/pengembangan/pengkajian/studi lapangan *) kepada:

Nama: INGRID DEWI PUSPASARI.
Alamat: Karang Malang Yogyakarta
Judul: DESIGNING A RUBRIC TO ASSESS VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS’ WRITING.

Lokasi: Yogyakarta.
Waktu: 3 (tiga) bulan.
Mulai tanggal: 01 Nopember s/d 01 Februari 2011.

Dengan ketentuan:
1. Menyerahkan surat keterangan/ijin survei/penelitian/pendataan/pengembangan/pengkajian/studi lapangan *) cair Pemerintah Provinsi DIY kepada Bupati/Walikota melalui institusi yang berwenang mengeluarkan ijin clinaksud;
2. Menyerahkan softcopy hasil penelitiannya kepada Gubernur Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta melalui Biro Administrasi Pembangunan Setda Provinsi DIY dalam compact disk (CD) dan menunjukkan cetakan asli yang sudah disahkan dan dibubuhi cap institusi;
3. Ijin ini hanya dipergunakan untuk keperluan ilmiah, dan pemegang ijin wajib mentaati ketentuan yang berlaku di lokasi kegiatan;
4. Ijin penelitian dapat diperpanjang dengan mengajukan surat ini kembali sebelum berakhir waktunya;
5. Ijin yang diberikan dapat dibatalkan sewaktu-waktu apabila pemegang ijin ini tidak memenuhi ketentuan yang berlaku.

Dikeluarkan di: Yogyakarta
Pada tanggal: 01 Nopember 2010.
An, Sekretaris Daerah
Asisten Perekonomian dan Pembangunan
UB: Kepala Biro Administrasi Pembangunan

J. SURAT DJUMADAL
NIP: 19560403 198209 1 001

Tembusan disampaikan kepada Yth.
1. Gubernur Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta (sebagai laporan);
2. Walikota Yogyakarta cq Ka Dinas Perizinan;
3. Dinas Pendidikan Pemuda dan Olahraga Prov DIY;
4. Dekan Fak Bahasa dan seni UNY;
5. Yang bersangkutan
PEMERINTAH KOTA YOGYAKARTA
DINAS PERIZINAN
Jl. Kenari No. 56 Yogyakarta 55185 Telepon 514448, 515865, 515866, 562662
EMAIL : perizinan@jogja.go.id EMAIL INTRANET : perizinan@intra.jogja.go.id

SURAT IZIN

NOMOR : 070/2436
6557/34

Dasar : Surat izin / Rekomendasi dari Gubemur Kepala Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta
Nomor : 070/6349/V/2010 Tanggal 01/11/2010

Mengingat :
1. Peraturan Daerah Kota Yogyakarta Nomor 10 Tahun 2008 tentang Pembentukan, Susunan, Kedudukan dan Tugas Pokok Dinas Daerah
2. Peraturan Walikota Yogyakarta Nomor 85 Tahun 2008 tentang Fungsi, Rincian Tugas Dinas Perizinan Kota Yogyakarta;

Dijinkan Kepada : Nama : INGRITA DEWI PUSPASARI
Pekerjaan : Mahasiswa Fak. Bahasa dan Seni - UNY
Alamat : Kampus Karangmalang, Yogyakarta
Penanggungjawab : Drs. Suharto, M. Pd
Keperluan : Melakukan Penelitian dengan judul Proposal : DESIGNING A RUBRIC TO ASSESS VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' WRITING

Lokasi/Responden : Kota Yogyakarta
Waktu : 01/11/2010 Sampai 01/02/2011
Lampiran : Proposal dan Daftar Pertanyaan
Dengan Ketentuan :
1. Wajib Memberi Laporan hasil Penelitian kepada Walikota Yogyakarta (Cq. Dinas Perizinan Kota Yogyakarta)
2. Wajib Menjaga Tata tertib dan mentaati ketentuan-ketentuan yang berlaku setempat
3. Izin ini tidak disanggakan untuk tujuan tertentu yang dapat mengganggu kestabilan Pemerintah dan hanya diperlukan untuk keperluan ilmiah
4. Surat izin ini sewaktu-waktu dapat dibatalkan apabila tidak dipenuhinya ketentuan-ketentuan tersebut diatas
Kemudian diharap para Pejabat Pemerintah setempat dapat memberi bantuan sepernya

Tanda tangan
Pemegang Izin

INGRITA DEWI PUSPASARI

Tembusan Kepada :
Yth. 1. Walikota Yogyakarta(sebagai laporan)
4. Kepala SMK Negeri 5 Yogyakarta

Dikeluarkan di : Yogyakarta
pada Tanggal : 09-11-2010

Kepala Dinas Perizinan

DRS. HERTIKA AYAWAN
NIP 19591114198903 1 004
SURAT KETERANGAN
NO: 070/515/

Yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini Kepala SMK Negeri 5 Yogyakarta menerangkan dengan sesungguhnya bahwa:

Nama : INGRITA DEWI PUSPASARI
NIM : 06202241042
Program Studi : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Fakultas : Bahasa dan Seni
Universitas : Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

Yang bersangkutan telah melakukan penelitian di SMK Negeri 5 Yogyakarta dari tanggal 14 Januari 2011 s.d 15 April 2011, dengan judul penelitian:
"Designing a Rubric to Assess Vocational High School Students Writing"

Demikian Surat Keterangan ini kami buat untuk dapat digunakan sebagaimana mestinya.

Yogyakarta, 4 Mei 2011
Kepala Sekolah

SUYONO, S.Pd, M.Eng
NIK. 19580623 198003 1 004
SURAT KETERANGAN / IJIN

Tanggal Surat: 12 Oktober 2010.

Mengingat:

DIJINKAN untuk melakukan kegiatan survei/penelitian/pendataan/pengembangan/pengajian/studi lapangan *) kepada:

Nama: INGRITA DEWI PUSPARI
Alamat: Karang Wangi Yogyakarta
Judul: DESIGNING A RUBRIC TO ASSESS VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS’ WRITING.

Lokasi: Yogyakarta.
Waktu: 3 (tiga) bulan.

Mulai tanggal: 01 November s/d 01 Februari 2011.

Dengan ketentuan:
1. Menyerahkan surat keterangan/ijin survei/penelitian/pendataan/pengembangan/pengajian/studi lapangan *) dan Pemerintah Provinsi DIY kepada Bupati/Walikota melalui instansi yang berwenang mengeluarkan ijin diriakui;
2. Menyerahkan softcopy hasil penelitiannya kepada Gubernur Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta melalui Biro Administrasi Pembangunan Setda Provinsi DIY dalam compact disk (CD) dan menjukukan cetakan asli yang sudah disahkan dan dibubuhkan diakasi kepada;
3. Ijin ini hanya diperpanjang untuk keperluan ilmiah, dan perpanjangan ijin wajib menuang ketentuan yang berlaku di dalam kegiatan;
4. Ijin penelitian dapat diserahkan dengan mengajukan surat ini kembali sebelum berakhir waktunya;
5. Ijin yang diberikan dapat disalakan sewaktu-waktu apabila penting jang ini tidak menerima ketentuan yang berlaku.

Dikeluarkan di: Yogyakarta.
Pada tanggal: 01 November 2010.

Ak. Sel. retoris Daerah
Asisten Perencanaan dan Pembangunan
Kepala Biro Administrasi Pembangunan

Penandaan disempakan kepada Yth.
1. Gubernur Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta (semua laporan);
2. Wakil Gubernur Yogyakarta (semua laporan);
3. Direksi Pendidikan dan Olahraga Prov DIY
4. Dekan Fakultas Ilmu dan Seni UNY.
5. Yang bersangkutan.