

DESIGNING A SPECIFIC EFL WRITING RUBRIC FOR A GENRE-BASED WRITING ASSESSMENT

Jhems Richard Hasan¹, Hasanuddin², Harto Malik³, Karmila Machmud⁴ and Alvons Habibie⁵

¹IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo

²Universitas Negeri Gorontalo

³Universitas Negeri Gorontalo

⁴Unieversitas Negeri Gorontalo

⁶IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo

*) **correspondent authors**

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.37500/IJESSR.2021.4327>

ABSTRACT

The goal of this research is to design an assessment rubric that specifically designed for a genre-based EFL writing assessment. The ability to construct fair and valid methods of assessing students' progress and achievement in learning process is a necessary skill for teachers. The main objective of this research is to design an assessment instrument in the form of a genre-based writing rubric. The rubric designing was carried out in several stages, they are conducting needs analysis, designing the first draft of rubric, validating the product by experts as validators, trying out and revising the product. This development model refers to the research and development model developed by Borg and Gall (2007). The result of the combination of the theory and the rubric model produces a model that is slightly different from the EFL writing rubrics in general. The rubric design focuses on the structural aspects of the text in the hortatory exposition text, which are Thesis, Arguments, and Recommendations. An aspect that is no less important to assess and often overlooked is the title of the text. It as an aspect that was also assessed as a whole text. In addition, this use of percentages (%) to replace the numbers that are usually found in EFL writing. The final product of this research is an EFL writing rubric that can be used widely in a genre-based writing assessment.

KEYWORDS: EFL Writing Rubric, Genre Based Approach, Hortatory Exposition Text, Writing Rubric Assessment.

BACKGROUND

The importance of carrying out assessment activities in a learning process becomes an obligation for every educator to give opportunities for their student to develop abilities and enhance their learning. Thus, teachers or lecturer needs to be able to determine the progress and achievement of the learners reasonably (Weigle, 2007, p. 195). In order to do so, lectures should understand the assessment instrument for assessing their students' work. A good understanding of the concept of assessment is helpful to design an excellent assessment design (Wang & Yang, 2017, p. 229).

Assessment is one of the crucial aspects of a series of learning. Gikandi, Morrow, & Davis (2011) stated that teaching and learning processes need to be assessment-centered to provide learners with opportunities to demonstrate their developing abilities and receive support to enhance their learning. However, an assessment must also be planned systematically and correctly so that the assessment results also show the actual quality of the learning process.

Language assessment has many principles which must be considered to support it as the best and the most suitable assessment for the students (Sabrina, 2016). Specifically in writing instruction, it requires students to produce an article relevant to the objectives to be achieved and is also inseparable from assessment. Therefore, effective writing instruction and assessment are essential elements for student success as they pass through school and prepare for work or college (Sundeen, 2014).

Writing instructions, in Indonesia, is mostly based on genre-based approach, or also known as text-based learning (Derewianka, 2003). This approach has been developed from Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) which proposes a model of language comprising the context of a situation and the context of culture (Chaisiri, 2010; Lin, 2017). This approach assumes that a text is not only composed of structured sentences but more than that a text is a social product in which there are certain parts and Characteristics of a text (Badger & White, 2000; Martin, 2009; Phichiensathien, 2016; Tuan, 2011). Each text has a different structure depending on the context of when and where the text was made (Anderson, 2003; Carrell, 1992; Hovy, 2013; Phichiensathien, 2016; Watcharapunyawong & Usaha, 2013)

The assessment rubric to assess the student writing results in writing courses are generally using rubrics developed by several experts such as (Brown, 2007; Glass, 2005; Heaton, 1989). The writing evaluation rubric generally focuses on some aspects: Content, organization, language use, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. The assessment to the results of student writing in the form of texts in English tends to put more emphasis on aspects of the use of English grammar. Students' writing is graded and corrected merely at the level of syntax and writing ideas. Whereas texts that are genre-based, the essential components are not specifically assessed, such as the structure of the text.

The structure of the text in question is each paragraph contained in a unity of a text. A simple example, in the recount text, the first paragraph in the recount text is an orientation that contains an introduction by presenting information about who, where, and when the event occurred in the past. The second paragraph is events are a series of events that are usually delivered in chronological order. The last/third paragraph is reorientation which presents a summary of events and the previous two paragraphs. The three-paragraph structures are explained in depth in learning writing. The introduction to the structure of the text is often the main topic and spend most of the time, sometimes the lecturer repeats this topic so that student is not wrong in composing a good and correct whole text. But the fact is, in several opportunities in evaluating the results of student writing, this component actually does not get any portion at all to be assessed. The rubric in detail does not place the generic structure and

the lexicogrammatical aspects as the main requirements that should be assessed in a writing using genre-based approach is missing from those rubrics. Therefore, this research aims to design an appropriate and a specific evaluation/assessment rubric. The main objective of this research is to produce an assessment instrument in the form of an evaluation rubric for genre-based approach writing.

METHODOLOGY

This research is a research and development, which adapts the model of research and development by Gall, Gall & Borg (2007, p. 590). This model is considered as the most comprehensive among the other models because this model includes ten steps: a) assessing needs to identify the goals; b) conducting instructional analysis; c) analyzing learners and context; d) writing performance objectives; e) developing assessment instruments; f) developing instructional strategy; g) developing and selecting instructional materials; h) designing and conducting evaluation; i) revising the instruction; and j) designing and conducting evaluation. Due to the limitation of time, we adapt six steps to develop the educational product including conducting needs analysis, designing the first draft of rubric, conducting expert judgment, trying out the product and revising the product. This is in line with Gall, Gall & Borg's suggestion to adapt the steps of the research according to the necessity (2007, p. 575)

DATA COLLECTION

The data in this research were collected using instruments such as questionnaire, observation sheet, and interview protocol.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was distributed to 3 EFL lecturers and 25 EFL students to gain an initial picture of their perceptions regarding the designed rubric under this study. It is specifically designed to investigate the habits of students in writing. The questionnaire in this study was a closed questionnaire using a Likert scale with five answer choices, Strongly Agree, Agree, Don't Know, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

Observation sheet

The observation sheet was used for assessing lecturers' writing assessment documents used in their writing instructions. It also assess the results of the literature study on various sources relevant to this research. Observation sheets in this study were composed in tabular form containing the results of observations.

Interview

Interview protocol was used to gain the data related to how the writing assessment process has been done. It was also used to understand the lecturers' knowledge of writing/ genre-based writing rubrics. The interview model used in this study was semi structured interviews.

Data analysis

Qualitative descriptive analysis techniques conducted for gaining data from observations and interviews. Data from the two sources was done by inductive techniques which consist of three stages: Comparison between data, categorization, and presentation of data. The questionnaire sheet analysis is carried out by following these steps: (a) Turning each question into a score, (b) Summing the scores for each question, (c) calculating the average score of each component, (d) Calculating Percentage the score obtained divided by the maximum score and multiplied by 100%, (e) Change the percentage by category. Validation Sheet Analysis is performed using descriptive statistics.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The result from the questionnaire distributed to the lecturers shows that there is a need for an assessment instrument that made it easier for them to assess the results of student writing. This results then being confirmed by conducting an interview. The interview was conducted specifically on three lecturers who usually teach writing subjects. Interview questions focused on aspects of development related to the assessment of written results or assessment rubrics. The assessment rubric in this study is more specifically focused on the types of texts in English. In general, the results of research from the interview method are described as follows.

Learning writing process in the classroom.

The learning process of writing in the classroom, according to the lecturers, has been going well, but there are number of problems that are often encountered in organizing student ideas in one paragraph. These three lecturers often find inconsistency between main idea and explanatory ideas in one paragraph composed by students. Even worse, there is only one long sentence consists of two or three lines and is considered to be a paragraph. Subtle ideas are suspected because of lack of interest in reading among students. Besides that, the most common problem is English grammar. Sentence structure that is not in accordance with the rules of the English language are found in the results of student writing. This error not only violates the rules, but also, according to the lecturer, often makes confused in understanding the intention of the author. Vocabulary selection that is not suitable with the focused idea also often obscures the actual meaning, so that the results of the writing are difficult to understand. Another problem found is grading the student's writing.

The categorization of the level of students' ability to write honestly has not been well described. This is caused by the way the assessments by the lecturers are different. The assessment is done by examining the results of the writing which is more focused on the organizational aspects of the writer's ideas and grammar. Unsurprisingly, this is recognized by the three lecturers who have not met the maximum assessment criteria of the students' writing results. Then at the end of the interview, the three lecturers hoped that there was a rubric of assessment that could facilitate them in assessing students' writing in a comprehensive and in-depth manner. Especially in genre-based texts that are often taught to students.

Writing model assessment in the classroom.

Based on the results from the interview, lecturers supporting writing courses generally use a similar test model. Students are asked to choose the topics provided and write. The description test is adjusted to the type of text taught by the lecturer. In addition, the lecturer also uses a random sentence model, and students are asked to rearrange the sentences into perfect sentences to form a complete text. The lecturer gives a test every discussion about a type of text has been completed, also the lecturer gives a test during the midterm exam and also the final semester exam.

Initial design of writing assessment.

The initial design of the assessment rubric is carried out in several stages. This stage refers to the concept of Research and Development developed by Borg and Gall but simplified according to development needs. The stages in this process are described as follows:

Determining the rubric model.

The research rubric model in this study uses an analytical valuation model. This is based on the scoring model on several important elements in evaluating an article, especially genre-based writing and seeing in detail the mistakes made by the author. The design of this assessment model is based on several models that have been developed by previous experts such as Jacobs et.al (1981), EFL Portfolios Assessment Group Fairfax Country Public Schools, Virginia.

Decision of category.

In addition to referring to the assessment model referred to above, the research team also introduced specific categories that give different characteristics to each genre-based text, which is called the generic structure. This feature is shown in a text in each paragraph. In addition, the title of the text is sometimes neglected in the evaluation. For this study, the research team also proposed a special category for the rating of a good title from a document. Such two new categories will supplement the category of writing assessment that is commonly regarded in writing, such as Idea Formation, Language Use, Grammar and Mechanics. The introduction of this category will be the point of differentiation of the rubric model developed by the research team with a rubric model that has been widely used so far, especially in English education department setting.

Scaling scale.

The scaling scale in this assessment rubric refers to the rubric developed by the EFL Portfolios Assessment Group Fairfax Country Public Schools, Virginia. Scoring in this rubric uses six scoring scales: Emerging, Beginning, Developing, Expanding, Fluent, and Proficient. But in the study, researchers only used a scaling model with a scale of 5. So that the rubric model developed with a vulnerable score of 5 is as follows: Below, Beginning, Developing, Fluent, and Proficient.

The form of scoring is believed to represent the overall competence of students in writing. So, the level of student achievement in writing can be described as a whole. The assessment of student writing can

be assessed simultaneously both qualitatively and quantitatively. The scoring sequence in quantitative terms above is adjusted qualitatively as follows:

Scale 1: Below (Writing competencies for Pre-Beginners)

Scale 2: Beginning (Beginner level writing competency)

Scale 3: Developing (Intermediate writing competence)

Scale 4: Fluent (Intermediate level writing competence)

Scale 5: Proficient (Advanced writing competency)

However, the five scales will be redrawn as a percentage (%) to make it more accessible for the evaluator. Vulnerable set of percentage scores (%) is considered to promote the assessment of the interest objectively compared with only the use of vulnerable scores 1-5. The scoring system of each vulnerable score as a percentage of the heading implemented in this study is defined as follows:

Table 1. Scoring Scale

Text Part/Structure	Score Qualities				
	Below	Beginning	Developing	Fluent	Proficient
Text title	5 %	10%	15%	20%	25%
Initial Paragraph	5 %	10%	15%	20%	25%
Content paragraph	5 %	10%	15%	20%	25%
Closing paragraph	5 %	10%	15%	20%	25%
Total	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%

The minimum value obtained is around 20% and the maximum value is 100%.

Determining the quality gradation.

Gradation of quality is the level of student achievement in writing, this is adjusted to the level of writing competence described in table 1. The lowest level is the below and the highest is the level of proficiency. For more details, these gradations are described as follows:

Title of text.

One of the important points assessed in all aspects of written evaluation is the title of the text. The title of the text is important because in some cases the title of the text is made not in accordance with the rules of writing a title of the text. So, the researcher considers the title of the text to be one important point to be assessed. A gradation description for the title of the text can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Text Gradation

Text Structure/Features	Gradation quality	Description
Text Title	Below	The text title does not contain: (1) main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) too simple, less dense and clear.
	Beginning	The title text contains a little: (1) Main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, Solid and Clear
	Developing	The text title is sufficient to describe: (1) Main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, Solid and Clear
	Fluent	The text title contains: (1) Items- (1) Main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, Solid and Clear
	Proficient	The title of the text perfectly describes: (1) Main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, Solid and Clear

Initial paragraph.

In genre-based texts, there are different types of text structures. So, the description is also different. In this study, we focused on the type of hortatory text exposition. In this text, the first paragraph is called a thesis. In this paragraph, there are special Characteristics that must be contained from this paragraph. So. this rubric is developed based on the genre-based approach theory. A clearer description of the assessment of the structure of this text can be found in the following table:

Table 3. Initial Paragraph Description

Text Structure	Gradation Quality	Description
Initial Paragraph	Below	<p>Special Characteristics: There is no author's opinion on the topic. It doesn't use a temporal connective at all.</p> <p>General Characteristics: The main idea and explanation are not related. Every sentence had a grammar error and it was confusing. Wrong diction. there is a mechanical error in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that is repeated and obscures the meaning.</p>
	Beginning	<p>Special Characteristics: The author's opinion is unclear and sometimes does not match the topic of the problem. It does not use a temporal connective at all.</p> <p>General Characteristics: The main idea is less clear and not supported by explanatory and corroborating ideas. Lots of confusing grammatical mistakes. Use of improper diction. There are many errors in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that slightly obscure the meaning.</p>
	Developing	<p>Special Characteristics: The opinion of the author is unclear but is still related to the topic in question. Very little use of temporal connective.</p>

		<p>General Characteristics: There is a main idea but not supported by a corroborating explanation. There are some grammatical errors that are a bit confusing. Use of improper diction. There are several errors in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that slightly obscure the meaning</p>
	Fluent	<p>Special Characteristics: Contains the opinion of the author or speaker regarding the topic in question. Less use of a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. There is a slight error in grammar but it is understandable. The use of diction is not quite right. There are a few errors (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) but they do not obscure the meaning.</p>
	Proficient	<p>Special Characteristics: Contains the opinion of the author or speaker regarding the topic in question. Using a temporal connective. Using the Simple present tenses</p> <p>General Characteristics: (1) There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. Use proper diction. There is no error (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization).</p>

Content paragraph.

In this paragraph, students are expected to be able to express their opinions which are supported by various references. The strength of this hortatory text lies in this paragraph. If the writer succeeds in presenting an opinion that convinces the reader, then the purpose of this text is considered successful because it is able to persuade the reader to at least agree with the writing. Therefore, the assessment in this paragraph, by including special Characteristics and general Characteristics that are adapted to the genre-based approach theory, can be described as follows:

Table 4. Description of Quality Gradation in Content Paragraph

Text Structure	Quality Gradation	Description
Content Paragraph	Below	<p>Special Characteristics: Contains the author's opinion and is not clear about the direction. It doesn't use a temporal connective at all.</p> <p>General Characteristics: The main idea and explanation are not related. Every sentence had a grammar error and it was confusing. Wrong diction. There is a mechanical error in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that is repeated and obscures the meaning</p>
	Beginning	<p>Special Characteristics: Only contains your own opinion without being supported by other people's opinions and also data. It doesn't use a temporal connective at all.</p> <p>General Characteristics: The main idea is less clear and not supported by explanatory and corroborating ideas. Lots of confusing grammatical mistakes. Improper use of diction. There are many errors in writing mechanics (Spelling,</p>

		Punctuation, Capitalization) which obscure the meaning a little.
	Developing	<p>Special Characteristics: There is little support for the opinion of others to influence the reader. Very little use of temporal connection</p> <p>General Characteristics: There is a main idea but not supported by a corroborating explanation. There are some grammatical errors that are a bit confusing. Use of improper diction. There are several errors in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that slightly obscure the meaning</p>
	Fluent	<p>Special Characteristics: Include your own opinion and elaborate on the opinions of others. Use multiple temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. There is a slight error in grammar but it is understandable. The use of diction is not quite right. There are a few errors (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) but they do not obscure the meaning</p>
	Proficient	<p>Special Characteristics: Contains one's own opinion which is corroborated by the opinions of others and proven by factual data that can influence the reader. Using a temporal connective. Using the Simple present tenses.</p>

		General Characteristics: (1) There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. Use proper diction. There is no error (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization).
--	--	--

Final paragraph.

This paragraph is a paragraph that contains the author's recommendations to readers. This recommendation was born because of the arguments that emerged earlier. By referring to the opinions that have been stated in the previous paragraph, the writer is able to place his position and convey recommendations that can seduce or persuade readers to agree with the author's opinions to the stage of changing the viewpoint of a reader and even influencing him to do what has been recommended. The description of the quality gradation in the special assessment in this final paragraph is illustrated in table 5 below:

Table 5. Description of Quality Gradation in Final Paragraph

Text Structure	Quality Gradation	Description
Final Paragraph	Below	Special Characteristics: There is no author recommendation. Paragraphs are only in the form of rewriting the opinion and introduction to the writing, the final paragraph is not made. It doesn't use a temporal connective at all. General Characteristics: The main idea and explanation are not related. Every sentence had a grammar error and it was confusing. Wrong diction. there is a mechanical error in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that is repeated and obscures the meaning
	Beginning	Special Characteristics: The author only rewrites his opinion and there are no

		<p>recommendations for the reader. It doesn't use a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics: The main idea is less clear and not supported by explanatory and corroborating ideas. Lots of confusing grammatical mistakes. Improper use of diction. There are many errors in writing mechanics (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) which obscure the meaning a little.</p>
	Developing	<p>Special Characteristics: The position of the writer is less clear and the reader is not affected by the issue in dispute. Very little use of temporal connection</p> <p>General Characteristics: There is a main idea but not supported by a corroborating explanation. There are some grammatical errors that are a bit confusing. Use of improper diction. There are several errors in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that slightly obscure the meaning</p>
	Fluent	<p>Special Characteristics: The author recites the opinions of others and makes suggestions. Use multiple temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. There is a slight error in grammar but it is understandable. The use of diction is not quite right. There are a few errors</p>

		(Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) but they do not obscure the meaning
	Proficient	<p>Special Characteristics: Contains the affirmation of the author's position and the author's recommendations to readers regarding the topic raised. Using a temporal connective. Using the Simple present tenses</p> <p>General Characteristics: (1) There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. Use proper diction. There is no error (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization).</p>

After the above qualification gradations have been defined, an interval scale is calculated for the achievement of student writing skills. Based on the determination of the scoring technique that has been described previously, the value susceptibility is obtained with a percentage model that is between 20% - 100%. From this percentage model score is then made a score interval score and an explanation of the competence of the value obtained. The score description for each category of text structure can be described in the following table:

Table 6. Score Description for Each Category of Text Structure

Score Interval	Description
81% - 100%	Demonstrate excellent understanding in composing a text based on the goals, and mastering the use of grammar and mechanics of writing. At this interval, the quality of the writing is classified at the advanced level (proficient)
61% - 80%	Demonstrate a good understanding by the writer in composing a text based on his goals; good mastering the use of grammar and mechanics of a writing. At this interval, the quality of the writing is classified at the upper intermediate level (Fluent)

41% - 60%	Demonstrate a fairly good understanding by the writer in composing a text based on its purpose; fairly good mastering the use of grammar and mechanics of a writing. At this interval the quality of the writing is classified at the intermediate level (Developing)
21% - 40%	Shows a lack of understanding by the writer in composing a text based on its purpose; a lack of mastering the use of grammar and mechanics of a writing. At this interval the quality of the writing is classified at the beginner level (Beginning)
0%- 20%	Shows the writer's lack of understanding in composing a text based on its purpose, lack of mastering the use of grammar and mechanics of a writing. At this interval the quality of the writing is classified at the pre-beginner level (Below)

After carrying out the above steps, the research team then formulated an initial draft or initial design of the assessment rubric which would later be tested at a later stage. The design formula can be seen in the following table:

Table 7. Assessment Rubric design (first phase)

	Proficient (25%)	Fluent (20%)	Developing (15%)	Beginning (10%)	Basic (5%)	Total Percentage
Text Title	Text Title Fully Provides: (1) Main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, solid, and clear	Text Title provides: (1) Main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, solid, and clear	Text title demonstrates enough: (1) Main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, solid, and clear	Text Title Demonstrates limited: (1) Main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, solid, and clear	Text title do not provide: (1) Main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, solid, and clear	

	Proficient (25%)	Fluent (20%)	Developing (15%)	Beginning (10%)	Basic (5%)	Total Percentage
Thesis	<p>Special Characteristics: Contains opinion of the author or speaker regarding the topic in question. Using a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics:</p>	<p>Special Characteristics: Contains the opinion of the author or speaker regarding the topic in question. Less use of a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics: There are main</p>	<p>Special Characteristics: The author's opinion is unclear but is still related to the topic in question. Very little use of temporal connective</p> <p>General Characteristics: There is a main idea but it is not supported by a corroborating</p>	<p>Special Characteristics: The author's opinion is unclear and sometimes does not match the topic of the problem. Do not use a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics: The main idea is less clear and not supported by</p>	<p>Special Characteristics: There is no author's opinion on the topic. Absolutely not use a temporal connective</p> <p>General Characteristics: The main idea and explanation are not related. Every sentence had a grammar error and it was confusing. Wrong diction. there is a mechanical error in the form (Spelling,</p>	

	(1) There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. Use proper diction. There is no error (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization).	ideas and explanatory ideas. There is a slight error in grammar but it is understandable. The use of diction is not quite right. There are a few errors (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) but they do not obscure the meaning	explanation. There are some grammatical errors that are a bit confusing. Improper use of diction. There are several errors in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that slightly obscure the meaning	explanatory and corroborating ideas. Lots of confusing grammatical mistakes. Use of improper diction. There are many errors in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that slightly obscure the meaning.	Punctuation, Capitalization) that is repeated and obscures the meaning	
Arguments	Proficient(25%)	Fluent (20%)	Developing (15%)	Beginning (10%)	Basic (5%)	Total Percentage
	Special Characteristics: Contains one's own opinion which is corroborated by the opinions of others and proven by factual data that can influence the reader. Using a	Special Characteristics: Include your own opinion and elaborate on the opinions of others. Use multiple temporal connective. General Characteristics: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas.	Special Characteristics: Include your own opinion and elaborate with the opinions of others. Use multiple temporal connective. General Characteristics: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. There is a	Special Characteristics: Only contains your own opinion without being supported by other people's opinions and also data. Do not use a temporal connective. General Characteristics: The main idea is less clear and not	Special Characteristics: Contains the author's opinion and is not clear about the direction. Absolutely not use a temporal connective General Characteristics: The main idea and explanation are not related. Every sentence had a grammar error and it was confusing.	

	<p>temporal connective. Using the Simple present tenses</p> <p>General Characteristics:</p> <p>(1) There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. Use proper diction. There are no errors (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization). but it does not obscure meaning</p>	<p>There is a slight error in grammar but it is understandable. The use of diction is not quite right. There are a few errors in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) but they do not obscure the meaning</p>	<p>slight error in grammar but it is understandable. The use of diction is not quite right. There are a few errors in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) but they do not obscure the meaning</p>	<p>supported by explanatory and corroborating ideas. Lots of confusing grammatical mistakes. Improper use of diction. There are many errors in writing mechanics in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) which slightly obscure the meaning.</p>	<p>Wrong diction. there is a mechanical error in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that is repeated and obscures the meaning</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	---	--

Recommendation	Proficient (25%)	Fluent (20%)	Developing (15%)	Beginning (10%)	Basic (5%)	Total Percentage
	<p>Special Characteristics: Contains affirmation of the author's position and author's recommendations to readers regarding the topic raised. Using a temporal connective. Using the Simple present tenses</p> <p>General Characteristics: (1) There are main ideas and</p>	<p>Special Characteristics: The author recites the opinions of others and makes suggestions. Use multiple temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. There is a slight error in grammar but it is understandable. The use of diction is not quite right. There are a few errors (Spelling,</p>	<p>Special Characteristics: The position of the writer is less clear and the reader is not affected by the issues in dispute. Very little use of temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics: There is a main idea but it is not supported by a corroborating explanation. There are some grammatical errors that are a bit confusing. Use of improper diction. There are several errors in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that</p>	<p>Special Characteristics: The author only rewrites his opinion and there are no recommendations for the reader. Do not use a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics: The main idea is less clear and not supported by explanatory and corroborating ideas. Lots of confusing grammatical mistakes. Improper use of diction. There are many errors in writing mechanics in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) which</p>	<p>Special Characteristics: There is no author recommendation. Paragraphs are only in the form of rewriting of opinions and introduction to writing, the final paragraph is not made. Absolutely not use a temporal connective</p> <p>General Characteristics: The main idea and explanation are not related. Every sentence had a grammar error and it was confusing. Wrong diction. there is a mechanical error in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that is repeated and obscures the meaning</p>	

	<p>explanatory ideas. Use proper diction. There is no error (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization)</p>	<p>Punctuation, Capitalization) but they do not obscure the meaning</p>	<p>slightly obscure the meaning</p>	<p>slightly obscure the meaning.</p>		
--	---	---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	--

Adapted from rubric designed by Jacobs et.al (1981) & EFL Portfolio Assessment Group Fairfax Country Public Schools, Virginia.

Field trial.

The field trial phase was carried out on a sample of 8 students' hortatory exposition writings. The writing is distributed to two lecturers who teach writing courses. The students' writing was assessed using the initial draft of the assessment rubric that had been designed in the previous stage by the research team. The results of the assessment can be seen in the following table:

Table 8. Results of the Research Team and Lecturers Assessment

Writing	Assessment Result			Writing	Assessment Result		
	Researcher	Lecturer A	Final Score		Researcher	Lecturer B	Final Score
A1	80%	82%	81%	B1	91%	88%	89,5%
A2	76%	75%	75,5%	B2	77%	76%	76,5%
A3	84%	81%	82,5%	B3	85%	85%	85%
A4	87%	85%	86%	B4	89%	91%	90%

From this table, it can be seen that there is a slight gap in the assessment results between the research team and Lecturer A and Lecturer B. The difference in assessment in writing A1 is 2%, A2 = 1%, A3 = 3%, and A4 = 2%. Meanwhile, in group B, the difference in assessment between the researcher and the Lecturer B was B1 = 3%, B2 = 1%, B3 = 0% and B4 = 2%. From these results, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in assessment between the research team and also the two lecturers who teach the Writing subject in the English Teaching Department.

After the product assessment trial by the lecturer, a questionnaire to the lecturer to get responses about the rubric developed by the research team. The results of this questionnaire were used as the basis for revising the initial draft of the assessment rubric developed by the research team. The following is the result of the lecturer response questionnaire to the rubric of student writing assessment based on the genre approach.

Table 9. Rubric Assessment Questionnaire Results

No	Statement										Total
	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	
Lecturer A	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	3	4	4,3
Lecturer B	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	3	4,2

Information:

P1 = Understanding of the Use of Rubrics

P2 = Selection of the assessment category

P3 = understanding of the language used

P4 = Understanding of the assessment criteria

P5 = Effectiveness of the range of values for each criterion

P6 = Practicality of the rubric form

P7 = Objectivity of the assessment using a rubric

P8 = The conformity between the assessment category and the writing material content

P9 = Usefulness of the rubric in measuring students' writing competence

P10 = Rubric helps students understand the structure of a text

From these results it can be concluded that the results of the questionnaire show a positive value on the use of the assessment rubric developed by the research team. The lecturer considered that the use of this rubric was effective in providing objective scores on the students' writing. The use of rubrics is also considered to make it easier for lecturers to assess.

The results of this questionnaire were not the main benchmark, they were then followed up with a discussion the teaching lecturer. Lecturers and the research team conducted another evaluation on several parts that might be considered still needs improvement. From the results of the discussion, the research team obtained several inputs, they are: (1) Add the author's identity column and the time of writing, (2) The use of color in the table also encourages lecturers to judge a little, (3) because the Content paragraph is more dominant, it is better if the weight of the assessment of the content paragraph is given a larger portion than the others, (4) Eliminate the word total in the percentage column because it can confuse the assessor, (5) Provide a comment column for the assessor, (6) Provide a description of the value interval or formula that makes it easier for the assessor to calculate the final value of student writing results, (7) Consistent use of language in the rubric. The results of this discussion then become the main inputs in revising the rubric.

The revised rubric.

This stage is a product revision in the form of an assessment rubric based on the results of the evaluation of the research team and also the writing subject lecturer. The revised rubric results are not only in terms of appearance but are also more dominant in the aspect of the category being assessed and the assessment scores that must be distinguished from one another. The difference of the level of difficulties in composing each paragraph becomes a measure of why the scores for each paragraph structure forming must be distinguished. The revision result of this rubric is the final stage of developing this rubric.

The following is the final result of the rubric design for the assessment of students' writing in the English Language Teaching Department, FITK, IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo.

Table 10. The Final Design

Student Identity	
Name	
Class	
Date	

Text Title	Proficient (13% - 15%)	Fluent (10% - 12%)	Developing (7% - 9%)	Beginning (4% - 6%)	Basic (0% - 3%)	Percentage
		The title of the text perfectly describes: (1) Main things that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, Solid and Clear	The text title contains: (1) Items- (1) Main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, Solid and Clear	The text title is sufficient to describe: (1) Main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, Solid and Clear	The title text contains a little: (1) Main points that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, Solid and Clear	The text title does not contain: (1) Main things that reflect the entire content of the text, (2) Simple, Solid and Clear
Thesis	Proficient (21% - 25%)	Fluent (16% - 20%)	Developing (11% - 15%)	Beginning (6% - 10%)	Basic (0% - 5%)	Percentage
	<p>Special Characteristics: Contains the opinion of the author or speaker regarding the topic in question. Using a temporal connective. Using the Simple present tenses</p> <p>General Features: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. Use proper diction. There are no errors in the form of (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization).</p>	<p>Special Characteristics: Contains the opinion of the author or speaker regarding the topic in question. Less use of a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Features: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. There is a slight error in grammar but it is understandable. The use of diction is not quite right. There are a few classifications in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) but they do not obscure the meaning</p>	<p>Special Characteristics: The opinion of the author is unclear but is still related to the topic in question. Very little use of temporal connection.</p> <p>General Characteristics: There is a main idea but it is not supported by a corroborating explanation. There are some grammatical errors that are a bit confusing. Use of improper diction. There are several classes in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that slightly obscure the meaning</p>	<p>Special Characteristics: The author's opinion is unclear and sometimes does not match the topic of the problem. Do not use a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics: The main idea is less clear and not supported by explanatory and corroborating ideas. Lots of confusing grammatical mistakes. Use of improper diction. There are many classifications in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that slightly obscure the meaning.</p>	<p>Special Feature: There is no author's opinion on the topic. Absolutely not use a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Feature: The main idea and explanation are not related. Every sentence had a grammar error and it was confusing. Wrong diction. there is a mechanical error in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that is repeated and obscures the meaning</p>	

	Proficient (33% - 40%)	Fluent (25% - 32%)	Developing (17% - 24%)	Beginning (9% - 16%)	Basic (0% - 8%)	Percentage
Arguments	<p>Special Characteristics: Contains author's own opinion which is corroborated by the opinions of others and proven by factual data that can influence the reader. Using a temporal connective. Using the Simple present tenses</p> <p>General Characteristics: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. Use proper diction. There is no class (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization), Punctuation, Capitalization) but it does not obscure the meaning</p>	<p>Special Features: Include author's own opinion and elaborate on the opinions of others. Use multiple temporal connectives.</p> <p>General Features: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. There is a slight error in grammar but it is understandable. The use of diction is not quite right. There are a few classifications (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) but they do not obscure the meaning</p>	<p>Special Features: Include author's own opinion and elaborate with the opinions of others. Use multiple temporal connectives.</p> <p>General Features: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. There is a slight error in grammar but it is understandable. The use of diction is not quite right. There are a few classifications (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) but they do not obscure the meaning</p>	<p>Special Features: Only contains author's own opinion without being supported by other people's opinions and also data. Do not use a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics: The main idea is less clear and not supported by explanatory and corroborating ideas. Lots of confusing grammatical mistakes. Improper use of diction. There are many classifications in writing mechanics in the form of (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) which obscure the meaning a little.</p>	<p>Special Characteristics: Contains the author's opinion and is not clear about the direction. Absolutely not use a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Feature: The main idea and explanation are not related. Every sentence had a grammar error and it was confusing. Wrong diction. there is a mechanical error in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that is repeated and obscures the meaning</p>	
Recommendation	<p>Proficient (17% - 20%)</p> <p>Special Characteristics: Contains affirmation of the author's position and author's recommendations to readers regarding the topic raised. Using a temporal connective. Using the Simple present tenses</p> <p>General Features: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. Use proper diction. There is no class (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization).</p>	<p>Fluent (13% - 16%)</p> <p>Special Feature: The author recites the opinions of others and makes suggestions. Use multiple temporal connectives.</p> <p>General Features: There are main ideas and explanatory ideas. There is a slight error in grammar but it is understandable. The use of diction is not quite right. There are a few classifications (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) but they do not obscure the meaning</p>	<p>Developing (7% - 12%)</p> <p>Special Feature: The position of the author is less clear and the reader is not affected by the issues in dispute. Very little use of temporal connectives.</p> <p>General Characteristics: There is a main idea but it is not supported by a corroborating explanation. There are some grammatical errors that are a bit confusing. Use of improper diction. There are several classifications in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that slightly obscure the meaning.</p>	<p>Beginning / (5% - 8%)</p> <p>Special Feature: The author only rewrites his opinion and there are no recommendations for the reader. Do not use a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Characteristics: The main idea is less clear and not supported by explanatory and corroborating ideas. Lots of confusing grammatical mistakes. Improper use of diction. There are many classifications in writing mechanics in the form of (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that slightly obscure the meaning.</p>	<p>Basic (0% - 4%)</p> <p>Special Features: There is no author recommendation. Paragraphs are only in the form of rewriting of opinions and introduction to writing; the final paragraph is not made. Absolutely not use a temporal connective.</p> <p>General Feature: The main idea and explanation are not related. Every sentence had a grammar error and it was confusing. Wrong diction. there is a mechanical error in the form (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization) that is repeated and obscures the meaning.</p>	

<i>Lecturers' Comments:</i>	<i>Total Score</i>
-----------------------------	--------------------

Total Score	Competence Level
81% - 100 %	Proficient
61% - 80%	Fluent
41% - 60%	Developing
21% - 40%	Beginning
0% - 20%	Below

Conclusion dan Implication.

Learning an assessment are so interwoven that a full picture cannot be identified if any of them is missing (Mohamadi, 2018, p. 29). Because the assessment serves to measure the extent of student achievement after following the learning process (Bachman, 2013, p. 2). Assessment can also give a picture to the teacher, and be a material for reflection in determining the future of learning process for the better.

The purpose of this research is to develop a product in the form of a writing assessment rubric based on the genre approach (Genre Based Approach). The rubric design model was developed based on the Genre Based Approach theory and was also adapted from existing rubrics by Jacobs et.al (1981) & EFL Portfolio Assessment Group Fairfax Country Public Schools, Virginia.

The result of the combination of the theory and the rubric model produces a model that is slightly different from the rubrics in general. The rubric design developed by the researcher focuses on the structural aspects of the text in the hortatory exposition text, they are Thesis, Arguments, and Recommendations. An aspect that is no less important to assess and often overlooked is the title of the text. The research team realized this and included it as an aspect that was also assessed as a whole text. In addition, the new thing offered in this developed design is the use of percentages (%) to replace the numbers that are usually found in rubrics that have been previously developed by experts. The use of percentages is considered to make it easier for the assessor to give weight to the scores for each element being assessed.

After the rubric design was made and tested on the students' writing, it was found that the difference in the final score of students involving two lecturers and also two researchers was not significantly different. This gives an idea that the rubric that has been developed is valid and reliable as an instrument for assessing a writing in the form of a hortatory exposition text. The design of this rubric also received a positive response from users, who are lecturer who teaches writing courses in the English Language Department, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo.

To sum up, this assessment rubric is specifically designed for assessing a writing with the elements of genre-based approach; therefore, it can be widely applied to assess EFL students' writing that specifically taught in writing subject by using genre-based approach.

REFERENCES

- Anderson. (2003). *Text Types in English*. South Yara: Macmilan Education Australia.
- Bachman, L. F. (2013). Ongoing Challenges in Language Assessment. *The Companion to Language Assessment, October*, 1586–1604. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118411360.wbcla128>
- Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing Richard Badger and

Goodith White. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153–160.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Pearson Longman.

Carrell, P. L. (1992). Awareness of Text Structure: Effects on Recall. *Language Learning*.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1992.tb00698.x>

Chaisiri, T. (2010). Implementing a Genre Pedagogy to the Teaching of Writing in a University Context in Thailand. *Language Education in Asia*, 1(1), 181–199.
<https://doi.org/10.5746/leia/10/v1/a16/chaisiri>

Derewianka, B. (2003). Trends and issues in genre-based approaches. *RELC Journal*, 34(2), 133–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820303400202>

Gall, Gall & Borg (2007). *Educational research: An introduction, 8th edition*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Gikandi, J. W., Morrow, D., & Davis, N. E. (2011). Online formative assessment in higher education: A review of the literature. *Computers and Education*, 57(4), 2333–2351.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.06.004>

Glass, K. T. (2005). *Curriculum Design for Writing Instruction*. Corwin Press.

Heaton, J. B. (1989). *Writing English Language Test*. Longman Group UK.

Hovy, D. (2013). Learning semantic types and relations from text. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*.

Jacobs., Holly. L., Stephen, A., Zinggraf., Deanne. R., Wormuth, V., Faye, H., Jane, B., Hughey. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Lin, Z. (2017). Teaching EFL Writing: An Approach Based on the Learner's Context Model. *TESOL Journal*, 8(1), 142–165. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.265>

Martin, J. R. (2009). Genre and language learning: A social semiotic perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, 20(1), 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2009.01.003>

Mohamadi, Z. (2018). Comparative effect of online summative and formative assessment on EFL student writing ability. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 59.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2018.02.003>

Phichiensathien, P. (2016). Genre-based approach in Academic English Writing. *Pasaa Paritat*. Vol.

31.

- Sabrina, A. (2016). a Language Assessment Analysis of English National Examination in Indonesia. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 1(2), 177.
<https://doi.org/10.30659/e.1.2.177-195>
- Sundeen, T. H. (2014). Instructional rubrics: Effects of presentation options on writing quality. *Assessing Writing*, 21, 74–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2014.03.003>
- Tuan, L. T. (2011). Teaching writing through genre-based approach. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(11), 1471–1478. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.11.1471-1478>
- Wang, B., & Yang, Y. (2017). College English Teaching Assessment System in the Era of Big Data. *US-China Foreign Language*, 15(4), 227–231. <https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8080/2017.04.003>
- Watcharapunyawong, S., & Usaha, S. (2013). Thai EFL students' writing errors in different text types: The interference of the first language. *English Language Teaching*.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n1p67>
- Weigle, S. C. (2007). Teaching writing teachers about assessment. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.004>