CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher would like to present and examine the data which have been collected during the research. The first data was concerning on the development of the assessment rubric. The second data was the use of the assessment rubrics in learning process. The first data was obtained to answer the first research question, while the second data was examined to get the answer of the second research question. The researcher obtained all of the data through interview and documentation study.

A. Research Finding

1. The Development of the Assessment Rubrics

In this study, data of the development of the assessment rubrics was examined to answer the first research question. There were some indicators set up by the researcher in order to answer the first research question. The data was collected through interview technique and documentation study. For the interview technique, the researcher created an interview guide that consists of some indicators¹. Meanwhile, there was one indicator examined through documentation study. The documentation study was used to identify the quality

 $^{^{\}rm l}{\rm The}$ interview was conducted on Wednesday, December $10^{\rm th}$ 2014 at SMP Muhammadiyah 5 Surabaya.

of the assessment rubrics developed by English teachers of SMP Muhammadiyah 5 Surabaya.

The data from interview technique would be presented first. Here, the researcher interviewed two research subjects who teach English in the seventh and the eighth grade. In the explanation below, Teacher A refers to the seventh grade teacher, while Teacher B refers to the eighth grade teacher.

a. Teachers' Understanding of Assessment Rubric

The understanding of Teacher A and Teacher B about the importance of assessment rubric was good, but the way teachers define assessment rubric was not clear. They have been asked some questions dealing with assessment rubrics. The questions were about the definition of assessment rubric and its importance. According to Teacher A, assessment rubric was described as a rubric that the teacher uses to assess the students' ability, while Teacher B defined assessment rubric as characteristics or indicators to know the achievement level of students.

In addition, Teacher A stated that assessment rubric was very important because teachers could know students' score, limit the score, give clear description about the score that students get, and provide assessment criteria. Teacher B, then, stated that the assessment rubrics could give the teachers understanding about indicators and the learning aims of the assessment.

b. Elements Developed by the Teachers in the Assessment Rubrics

The only element developed by the Teacher A and Teacher B in the assessment rubrics was the assessment rubric criteria. Although all the learning materials and assessment criteria have been set up by the government, Teacher A still took some criteria from other sources. She took them from some assessment theories of TEFL and TESOL books, such as the books written by Brown, Hebert, and Harmer. From those books, Teacher A got a lot of idea in creating the assessment criteria. Teacher B was simpler. He only took the assessment criteria provided by government that suitable with the indicators, and then developed the assessment rubrics.

c. Teachers' Considerations in Developing the Assessment Rubrics

Teacher A and Teacher B had good consideration in developing the assessment rubrics. Both of them agreed that students' need, students' characteristic, and classroom condition were the teachers' considerations in developing the assessment rubrics.

Teacher A stated that students' need could be recognized by listening to the opinion of the students about the assessment and did not push them to do whatever the teachers' wants, but appreciating the students' view. In addition, Teacher A also stated that improving the knowledge and skill of the teacher in assessment field could be one of considerations in developing the assessment rubrics.

Therefore, Teacher B considered the learning aim as the important consideration. When the teacher knew the learning aim, the assessment indicators could be seen, and then the learning achievement could be measured using the assessment rubrics. Teacher B also emphasized more in the students' level. In a classroom, the level of students' ability was different. The teacher should pay attention to the students and give them an appropriate assessment rubric so that all the diverse level could be covered.

d. Combining Cambridge Curriculum and Curriculum 2013 Components in Developing the Assessment Rubrics

In combining Cambridge Curriculum and Curriculum 2013 components in developing the assessment rubrics, Teacher A and Teacher B faced some difficulties. They stated that under the implementation of Curriculum 2013, the teachers could not freely combine the Cambridge Curriculum and Curriculum 2013 components in developing the assessment rubrics. It was because the time allocation, the learning materials, and the assessment criteria have been set up by the government. The time allocation was set up strictly, so there was not enough time to combine them. Here, the teachers did not put a lot of effort or things in combining the Cambridge Curriculum and Curriculum 2013. Although the school uses Cambridge Curriculum, the teachers sometimes could only combine the Cambridge Curriculum and Curriculum 2013 through the learning materials and

methods because Cambridge Curriculum was not the main curriculum. It was just an additional one. The learning materials from Cambridge book combined should have similar topics. The learning materials combined was in the text forms. For the assessment rubrics, the teachers tended to use the assessment rubrics from Curriculum 2013.

In addition, the school decided to take a particular time in implementing the Cambridge Curriculum because the basic principle of the school in using this curriculum was to improve the students' ability. All the International classes was taught using Cambridge book on Friday. In that day, all the learning materials were taken from Cambridge book, but the assessment system and assessment rubrics used was from Curriculum 2013.

e. Teachers' Steps in Developing the Assessment Rubrics

In developing the assessment rubrics, the researcher asked some questions about the steps done by the teachers. Teacher A did not have any particular steps in developing the assessment rubrics, while Teacher B underlined a thing to be the first step in developing his assessment rubrics. It was the learning aims that to be used in deciding the learning indicators so that Teacher B could develop the assessment rubrics. Because the steps did not explained detail by the teachers, the researcher asked some questions based on the Erlandson and Brophy's theory in developing assessment rubric. From the interview result based on the Erlandson and Brophy's

theory, the following table showed the detail description of the interview result from the two teachers.

Table 4.1
The Research Finding: Interview Result Deals with the Ways Teachers
Develop the Assessment Rubrics

The Steps	Teacher A	Teacher B
Looking at models and adapting an existing		
assessment rubric		
Creating assessment rubric criteria		
Deciding the number of levels	√	
Developing descriptions of quality for each		-
level of criteria		
Using the assessment rubrics	-	-
Revising the assessment rubrics	-	
Benchmarking the assessment rubrics	-	-
Sharing the assessment rubrics	V	$\sqrt{}$

For further explanations, the detail explanation was described below.

The first step is looking at models and adapting an existing assessment rubric. Teacher A and B had different answer about this matter. Teacher A usually took some models from some sources. She took them from TEFL book and adapted them, while Teacher B only took the assessment rubric from Curriculum 2013 and then modified it. In addition, the teachers did not take a particular type of assessment rubric. Teacher A usually took and developed the assessment rubrics that suitable for the skills being assessed. For example, when assessing speaking skill, Teacher A used task-specific rubric, and so on. Meanwhile, Teacher B tended to modify the

assessment rubrics from Curriculum 2013. The adaptation and modification were done based on the students' need and level. Furthermore, the teachers did not involve students in choosing the assessment rubric models because they thought that the assessment rubrics were the rightful authority of the teachers. The teachers, in addition, stated that there was no importance for the students to decide the assessment rubric models.

The second step is creating assessment rubric criteria. Tor teacher A, the assessment rubric criteria established were taken from TEFL books, while Teacher B took the assessment rubric criteria from the assessment criteria provided by the government. Teacher B chose and took some criteria to be applied in his assessment rubrics based on the students' characteristic. Both of the teachers created the assessment rubric criteria by themselves.

The third step is deciding the number of levels. Teacher A and B used 4 or 5 levels in their assessment rubrics. The levels defined in variety of ways based on the sources they took. Teacher A often decided the number of levels she took from TEFL theory, while Teacher B picked it up from Curriculum 2013. They did it because they believed that the number of the levels from those sources were the most appropriate for their students.

The fourth step is developing descriptions of quality for each level of criteria. Both of teachers, Teacher A and Teacher B did not develop descriptions of quality for each level of criteria. They just used the provided descriptions of quality for each level of criteria from the sources they took.

They did not consider the importance of developing the descriptions of quality for each level of criteria because they thought that the descriptions have been stated clearly. They only took all the words of the descriptions of quality for each level of criteria without developing or modifying them.

The fifth step is using the assessment rubrics. Before the assessment rubrics were used in the actual learning process, teachers should try-out the assessment rubrics, but Teacher A and Teacher B did not do this step.

The last step is revising the assessment rubrics. In revising the assessment rubrics, the two teachers had different perspective. Teacher A argued that she did not need to revise the assessment rubrics because she had already known her students need. Before she developed the assessment rubrics or used them in assessing students, she decided the suitability of her assessment rubrics based on the learning indicators and students' skill being assessed. From that reason, she did not think that it was important to revise them. Different from Teacher A, Teacher B stated that revising the assessment rubrics was useful. Before revising the assessment rubrics, Teacher B reviewed the assessment rubrics individually. The review and revise process were usually done the day before the assessment rubrics were used in the learning process. The assessment rubrics were revised based on the skill being assessed.

In addition, there are also tips for developing the assessment rubrics. Two of the tips are to benchmark the assessment rubrics and share the assessment rubrics to other teachers and students. In this case, both of the teachers did not benchmark their assessment rubrics. They argued that they have known the students' need and level so that benchmarking was not an important thing to do.

In case of sharing the assessment rubrics, Teacher A and Teacher B told the researcher that all of the teachers at SMP Muhammadiyah 5 always had a month of training program during the school holiday. In the training program, the teachers were asked to make learning instructions including the assessment rubrics. Here, the teachers from the same subject were gathered together and shared their ideas about the task. The sharing process was done when the training program was held. From the training program, they could know each other learning instructions so that sharing the revised assessment rubrics seemed to be unnecessary anymore. For the students, Teacher A did not find it important to share the assessment rubrics to the students, while Teacher B usually shared only the criteria being assessed in spoken way.

f. Teachers' Strategies in Developing the Assessment Rubrics

Being asked about strategies in developing the assessment rubrics,

Teacher A and Teacher B stated that there was no particular strategy in

developing the assessment rubrics. All things related to learning assessment

have been set up and provided by the government in Curriculum 2013. The teachers only developed the assessment rubric criteria based on the students' need and level.

g. Teachers' Obstacles and Solutions in Developing the Assessment Rubrics

In developing the assessment rubrics, one of the teachers found an obstacle. The teacher stated that the obstacle was from the characteristic differ of the two curriculums, Cambridge Curriculum and Curriculum 2013. The teacher should decide the suitable learning materials for the students. The problem was the Cambridge Curriculum focuses on the grammar, while Curriculum 2013 emphasizes on the text form. To overcome this obstacle, the teacher took some tasks from learning materials of Cambridge book, although the assessment rubrics used were from Curriculum 2013. It would not distract the implementation of Curriculum 2013 because learning aims and indicators were taken from Curriculum 2013.

h. The Quality of the Assessment Rubrics Developed by the Teachers

In addition, examining the quality of the assessment rubrics was also done to answer the first research question. Here, the researcher conducted documentation study². In this study, to know the result of the

² The documentation study was done on Wednesday, November 26th 2014.

assessment rubrics developed by the teachers, the researcher examined the quality of 4 assessment rubrics develop by 2 English teachers of SMP Muhammadiyah 5 Surabaya. The assessment rubrics examined were 2 assessment rubrics of chapter 1 and chapter 2 of the seventh grade (developed by Teacher A), and 2 assessment rubrics of chapter 1 and chapter 3 of the eighth grade (developed by Teacher B). They were examined based on the grading rubric taken from Arter³. This analysis was done to find out the quality of the assessment rubrics.

The grading rubric contained 2 criteria which had 5 indicators. The scale of score for each criterion was 1, 3, and 5. They were interpreted as 1: weak, 3: medium, 5: strong. From the overall analysis, the following table shows the final result of each assessment rubric:

Table 4.2
The Final Result of Analysis of the Grading Rubrics Developed by the English Teachers

Assessment Rubric	Total Score	Final Result
1	60	Strong
2	54	Strong
3	48	Strong
4	60	Strong

From the table, it could be seen that all assessment rubrics were in strong level based on the grading rubric taken from Arter. The detail analysis

³ Judy Arter, *Creating & Recognizing Quality Rubrics* (Portland, Oregon: Pearson Assessment Training Institute, 2012). www.ati.pearson.com

of each criterion of those 4 assessment rubrics using the grading rubric was described as follows⁴:

Table 4.3
The Quality of Assessment Rubric 1 of Grade VII Chapter 1 (developed by Teacher A)

C-:4	T 32 4 -	D-4:	D-421.
Criterion	Indicator	Rating	Rationale
Coverage/	Cover the	1. 5	The content of the rubric represent
organizati	right		the best thinking in the field about
on	Content		what it means to perform well on the
			skill or product under consideration.
		2. 5	The content of the rubric aligns
	/		directly with the content standards/
			learning targets it is intended to
			assess.
		_ 11 11	
		3. 5	The content has the "ring of truth".
			8
	Criteria	1.5	The rubric divided into easily
	are well		understandable criteria as needed.
	organized		
	8	2.5	The details that are used to describe a
			criterion go together; they are facets
			of the same criterion.
	_		or one summe entrement
		3.5	The relative emphasis on various
		3.0	features of performance is right.
			reaction of performance is right.
		4.5	The criteria are independent. Each
			important feature that contributes to
			quality work appears in only one
			place in the rubric.
	Number of	3	Teachers might find it useful to
	levels fits		merge levels to suit the rubric's
	targets and		intended use. The number of levels
	targets and		interface use. The number of levels

_

⁴ The grading rubric was taken from Arter (Judy Arter, *Creating & Recognizing Quality Rubrics* (Portland, Oregon: Pearson Assessment Training Institute, 2012). www.ati.pearson.com) and the grading rubric can be seen in the appendix 4

	uses		could be adjusted easily.
Clarity	Levels	1. 5	Each score point (level) is defined
	defined well		with indicators and descriptors.
		2. 3	There is some attempt to define
			terms and include descriptors, but some key ideas are fuzzy in meaning.
		3. 5	Two independent users, with training and practice, assign the same rating most of time.
		4. 1	Rating is almost totally based on
			counting the number or frequency of
			something, even though quality is more important than quantity.
	/ /	N	more important than quantity.
		5. 3	Wording is mostly descriptive of the
		_71 /	work, but there are a few instances of evaluative labels.
	Levels	5	The levels of the rubric are parallel
	parallel		in content.

Table 4.4
The Quality of Assessment Rubric 2 of Grade VII Chapter 2 (developed by Teacher A)

Criterion	Indicator	Rating	Rationale
Coverage/	Cover the	1. 5	The content of the rubric represent
Organizati	right		the best thinking in the field about
on	content		what it means to perform well on the
			skill or product under consideration.
		2. 3	Some features don't align well with the content standards/ learning targets it is intended to assess.
		3. 5	The content has the "ring of truth"

	Criteria are well	1. 5	The rubric is divided into easily understandable criteria as needed.
	organized		diadigualdusic ericeria as ricedea.
	J	2. 5	The details that are used to describe a criterion go together; they are facets of the same criterion.
		3. 5	The relative emphasis on various features of performance is right.
		4. 1	Descriptors of quality work are represented redundantly in more than
			one criterion to the extent that criteria are really not covering different things.
	Number of	3	Teachers might find it useful to
	levels fits		merge levels to suit the rubric's
	targets and uses	~ /	intended use. The number of levels could be adjusted easily.
Clarity	Levels	1. 5	Each score point (level) is defined
Clarity	defined well	1. 3	with descriptors.
	Well	2. 3	There is some attempt to define
			terms and include descriptors, but
			some key ideas are fuzzy in meaning.
	-	3. 5	Two independent users, with training
			and practice, assign the same rating most of the time.
		4. 1	Rating is almost totally based on counting the number or frequency of
			something, even though quality is more important than quantity.
		5. 3	Wording is mostly descriptive of the
			work, but there are a few instances of evaluative labels.
	Levels	5	The levels of the rubric are parallel
	parallel		in content.
L	I I	1	

Table 4.5
The Quality of Assessment Rubric 3 of Grade VIII Chapter 1 (developed by Teacher B)

Criterion	Indicator	Rating	Rationale
Coverage/	Cover the	1. 5	The content of the rubric represent
Organizati	right		the best thinking in the field about
on	content		what it means to perform well on the
			skill or product under consideration.
		2. 5	The content of the rubric aligns
			directly with the content standards/
			learning targets it is intended to
			assess.
4	~	3. 5	The content has the "ring of truth"
	Criteria	1. 3	The number of criteria needs to be
	are well		adjusted a little: a single criterion
	organ <mark>ize</mark> d		should be made into two criteria.
		2 1	T1 1: ": 1 22
		2. 1	The rubric seems "mixed up".
			Things that are different are put
			together.
		3. 5	The relative emphasis on various
		5. 5	features of performances is right.
		4. 5	The criteria are independent. Each
		1. 5	important feature that contributes to
			quality work appears in only one
			place in the rubric.
	Number of	3	Teachers might find it useful to
	levels fits		merge levels to suit the rubric's
	targets and		intended use. The number of levels
	uses		could be adjusted easily.
Clarity	Levels	1. 5	Each score point (level) is defined
	defined		with indicators and descriptors.
	well		
		2. 3	There is some attempt to define
			terms and include descriptors, but
			some key ideas are fuzzy in meaning.

3. 1	It is unlikely that independent raters could consistently rate work the same, even with practice.
4. 1	Rating is almost totally based on counting the number or frequency of something, even though quality is more important than quantity.
5. 3	Wording is mostly descriptive of the work, but there are a few instances of evaluative label.
Levels 3 parallel	The levels are mostly parallel in content, but there some places where there is an indicator at one level that is not present at the other levels.

Table 4.6
The Quality of Assessment Rubric 4 of Grade VIII Chapter 3 (developed by Teacher B)

Criterion	Indicator	Rating	Rationale
Coverage/	Cover the	1. 5	The content of the rubric represent
Organizati	right		the best thinking in the field about
on	content		what it means to perform well on the
	-		skill or product under consideration.
		2. 5	The content of the rubric aligns
			directly with the content standards/
			learning targets it is intended to
			assess.
		3. 3	Much of the content is relevant, but
			you can easily think of some
			important things that have been left
	~		out or that have been short shrift.
	Criteria	1. 5	The rubric is divided into easily
	are well		understandable criteria as needed.
	organized		

		2. 5	The details that are used to describe a criterion go together; they are facets of the same criterion.
		3. 5	The relative emphasis on various features of performance is right.
		4. 5	The criteria are independent. Each important feature that contributes to quality work appears in only one place in the rubric.
	Number of levels fits targets and uses	3	Teachers might find it useful to merge levels to suit the rubric's intended use. The number of levels could be adjusted easily.
Clarity	Levels defined well	2. 3	Each score point (level) is defined with descriptors. There is some attempt to define terms and include descriptors, but some key ideas are fuzzy in meaning.
		3. 5	Two independent users, with training and practice, assign the same rating most of the time.
		4. 3	There is some descriptive detail in the form of words, adjectives, and descriptive phrases.
		5. 3	Wording is mostly descriptive of the work, but there are a few instances of evaluative labels.
	Levels parallel	5	The levels of the rubric are parallel in content.

For further explanations, the analysis of each criterion was described below.

1) Criterion 1: Coverage/organization

Coverage/organization criterion had 3 indicators, they are covering the right content, criteria are well organized, and number of levels fits targets and uses.

a) Indicator 1: Cover the right content

In this indicator, there were 3 points discussed. Based on point 1, four assessment rubrics developed by Teacher A and Teacher B had strong level. The strong level described that the content of the rubric represent the best thinking in the field about what it means to perform well on the skill or product under consideration. They could be seen in the assessment rubrics 1 which included *kelancaran* (fluency), *intonasi* (intonation), *pengucapan* (pronunciation), and *pemilihan kata* (diction) as the criteria of assessing speaking or language aspect, and assessment rubric 3 which was intended to measure the attitude competence included criteria of *kerajinan* and *ketekunan* (diligent), *tanggung jawab* (responsible), *kedisiplinan* (discipline), *kerja sama* (cooperate), and *kejujuran* (honesty).

Based on point 2, assessment rubrics 1, 3, and 4 had strong level, while assessment rubric 2 was labeled as medium one. The strong level stated that the content of the rubric aligns directly with the content standards/learning target it is intended to assess. It can be inferred from assessment rubrics 4 that intended to measure the

competence skill through written test. Things to be measured were tujuan komunikatif (communicative aim), keruntutan teks (text's harmony), pilihan kata (diction), and pilihan tata bahasa (grammar). The medium level of assessment rubric 2 stated that some features do not align well with the content standards/learning target it is intended to assess. Assessment rubric 2 did not state clearly what kind of indicator or skill wanted to measure⁵.

Based on point 3, assessment rubrics 1, 2, and 3 were in strong level, while assessment rubric 4 was in medium level. The strong level defined that content has the "ring of truth". In the assessment rubric 1, Teacher A assessed *kelancaran* (fluency), *pengucapan* (pronunciation), *intonasi* (intonation), and *pilihan kata* (diction) for her speaking test. Meanwhile, the medium level described that much of the content is relevant, but teacher can easily think of some important things that have been left out or that have been short shrift. In the assessment 4, though the skill being assessed was same, speaking skill, Teacher B did not include diction in his assessment rubric⁶.

_

⁵ See appendix 7

⁶ See appendix 9

b) Indicator 2: Criteria are well organized

In this indicator, there are 4 points to be examined. According to point 1, assessment rubric 1, 2, and 4 were in strong level, while assessment rubric 3 was in medium level. The strong level pointed out that the rubric is divided into easily understandable criteria as needed. It could be inferred from the criteria that established in assessment rubric 1. In assessment rubric 1, the criteria consisted of *kelancaran* (fluency), *pengucapan* (pronunciation), *intonasi* (intonation), and *pilihan kata* (diction). Here, all the criteria were needed to assess students' speaking ability.

Meanwhile, assessment rubric 3 was in medium level because the number of criteria needs to be adjusted a little, a single criterion should be made into two criteria. In assessment rubric 3 in assessing its skill competence, the criteria attached to criteria "ungkapan yang digunakan sesuai, pengucapan/intonasi tepat (expression used is appropriate, pronunciation/intonation is appropriate too)". In this case, the criteria could be devided into three criteria. They were the expression used, pronounciation, and intonation.

According to point 2, assessment rubric 1, 2, and 4 were also in strong level, while assessment rubric 3 was in weak level. The strong level described that the details that are used to describe a criterion go together; they are facets of the same criterion. The weak

one stated that the rubric seems "mixed up", and things that are different are put together. They also have been clear from the explanation of point 1 above.

According to point 3, all assessment rubrics examined were in strong level. The relative emphasis on various features of performance is right in those assessment rubrics. Here, almost all of the features were emphasized in the same way.

In addition, according to the last point, assessment rubrics 1, 3 and 4 were in strong level, while assessment rubric 2 was in weak level. The strong level stated that the criteria are independent, and each important feature that contributes to quality work appears in only one place in the rubric. From the case of assessment rubric 1, criteria of knowledge competence covered tujuan komunikatif (communicative aim), keruntutan teks (text's harmony), pilihan kata (diction), and bahasa (grammar), while kelancaran (fluency), pilihan tata (pronunciation), (intonation) pengucapan and intonasi were established in the skill competence criteria. Meanwhile, the weak level showed that descriptors of quality work are represented redundantly in more than one criterion to the extent that criteria are really not covering different things. In assessment rubric 2, *kelancaran* (fluency) and pilihan kata (diction) appeared twice in knowledge and skill competence.

c) Indicator 3: Number of levels fits target and uses

In number of levels fits targets and uses indicator, all assessment rubrics examined were in medium level. It stated that teachers might find it useful to merge levels to suit the rubric's intended use, and the number of levels could be adjusted easily. Most of them were used 5 levels in their assessment rubrics, but it could be adjusted into 3 levels.

2) Criterion 2: Clarity

Clarity criterion covered two indicators, they are levels defined well, and levels parallel.

a) Indicator 1: Levels defined well

In this indicator, there was five points covered. Based on point 1, all the assessment rubrics examined were in strong level. It means that each score point (level) is defined with descriptors. For example, in the assessment rubric 1, the descriptors of fluency criteria were described as follow.

Fluency

Skor 5 bila sangat lancar (score 5 if very fluent)

skor 4 bila lancar (score 4 if fluent)

skor 3 bila cukup lancar (score 3 if adequate fluent)

skor 2 bila kurang lancar (score 5 if not quite fluent)

skor 1 bila tidak lancar (score 5 if not fluent)

Figure 4.1

The Research Finding: Descriptor of Fluency criteria in Assessment Rubric 1 (Developed by Teacher A)

Based on point 2, all the assessment rubrics examined were in medium level. The medium level stated that there is some attempt to define terms and include descriptors, but some key ideas are fuzzy in meaning. Just like in the point 1 above, the level and descriptors of fluency criteria were presented, but there was fuzzy meaning in the descriptors.

Based on point 3, assessment rubric 1, 2, and 4 were in strong level, while assessment rubric 3 was in weak level. The strong level explained that two independent users, with training and practice, assign the same rating most of the time, while the weak one stated that it is unlikely that independent raters could consistently rate work the same, even with practice. Assessment rubric 1, 2, and 4 used criteria provided by the government so that the rate works are same. Meanwhile, assessment rubric 3 used two or more criteria in one level. As shown below.

Table 4.7
The Research Finding: The Criteria Used in Assessment Rubric 3
(Developed by Teacher B)

Uraian (criteria)	Skor (score)
Ungkapan yang digunakan sesuai, pengucapan/intonasi	3
tepat (expression used are appropriate,	
pronunciation/intonation is appropriate too).	
Ungkapan yang digunakan sesuai, intonasi kurang tepat	2
(expression used are appropriate, intonation is not quite	
appropriate).	
Ungkapan yang digunakan tidak sesuai (expression used	1
are inappropriate).	0
Tidak mempraktikkan dialog (do not do the dialogue).	

According to point 4, assessment rubric 1, 2, and 3 were in weak level, while assessment rubric 4 belonged to medium level. The weak level stated that rating is almost totally based on counting the number or frequency of something, even though quality is more important than quantity. For example, in assessment rubric 1, the levels were *Skor 5 bila sangat lancar* (score 5 if very fluent), *skor 4 bila lancar* (score 4 if fluent), *skor 3 bila cukup lancar* (score 3 if adequate fluent), *skor 2 bila kurang lancar* (score 5 if not quite fluent), and *skor 1 bila tidak lancar* (score 5 if not fluent). Meanwhile, the medium level implied that there is some descriptive detail in the form of words, adjectives, and descriptive phrases. It was described in

assessment rubric 4. The criterion was *disiplin* (discipline), and the levels are:

Disiplin (discipline)

BT=Belum Terlihat (not seen yet)

MT= Mulai Terlihat (begin to see)

MB=Mulai Berkembang (begin to develop)

MK=Membudaya Konsisten (consistent to be culture)

Figure 4.2

The Research Finding: Criteria of Discipline and its Levels in Assessment Rubric 4 (Developed by Teacher B)

Based on the last point, all the assessment rubrics examined were in medium level. It stated that wording is mostly descriptive of the work, but there are a few instances of evaluative labels. In assessment rubric 2 showed:

Table 4.8

The Research Finding: Descriptive and Evaluative Labels in Assessment Rubric 2 (Developed by Teacher A)

Kriteria (criteria)	Score
100% pilihan kata tepat (100% diction is appropriate)	5
80% pilihan kata tepat (80% diction is appropriate)	4
60% pilihan kata tepat (60% diction is appropriate)	3
40% pilihan kata tepat (40% diction is appropriate)	2
20% pilihan kata tepat (20% diction is appropriate)	1
Sangat lancar (very fluent)	5
Lancar (fluent)	4
Cukup lancar (adequate fluent)	3
Kurang lancar (not quite fluent)	2
Tidak lancar (not fluent)	1

b) Indicator 2: Levels parallel

In this indicator, assessment rubric 1, 2, and 4 were in strong level, while assessment rubric 3 was in the medium one. The strong level explained that the levels of the rubric are parallel in content. It can be seen in assessment rubric 2 below.

Percaya diri (confident)

- 5 = Tidak pernah menunjukkan sikap tidak percaya diri (never show the confidence)
- 4 = Pernah menunjukkan sikap tidak percaya diri (showed the confidence)
- 3 = Beberapa kali menunjukkan sikap tidak percaya diri (some times show the confidence)
- 2 = Sering menunjukkan sikap tidak percaya diri (often show the confidence)
- 1 = Sangat sering menunjukkan sikap tidak percaya diri (very often show the confidence).

Figure 4.3

The Research Finding: Parallel Levels in Assessment Rubric 2 (Developed by Teacher A)

Assessment rubric 3 as medium level indicated that the levels are mostly parallel in content, but there some places where there is an indicator at one level that is not present at the other levels. It could be shown in the assessment rubric below.

Table 4.9
The Research Finding: Unparallel Levels in Assessment Rubric 3
(Developed by Teacher B)

Uraian (criteria)	Skor
	(score)
Ungkapan yang digunakan sesuai, pengucapan/intonasi	3
tepat (expression used is appropriate,	
pronunciation/intonation is appropriate too).	
Ungkapan yang digunakan sesuai, intonasi kurang tepat	2
(expression used is appropriate, intonation is not quite	2
appropriate).	
Ungkapan yang digunakan tidak sesuai (expression used is	
inappropriate).	1
<i>Tidak mempraktik<mark>kan dialog</mark></i> (d <mark>o n</mark> ot do the dialogue).	0

Those are the research findings concerning on the development of the assessment rubrics, and the quality of the assessment rubrics developed by the English teachers of SMP Muhammadiyah 5 Surabaya, examined based on Erlandson and Brophys' theory and grading rubric from Arter. All of these data are further analyzed and interpreted on the discussion.

2. The Use of the Assessment Rubrics in Learning Process

Data of the use of the assessment rubrics in learning process was examined to answer the second research question. The data was also collected from interview technique⁷. Some indicators have been examined by the researcher. The research subjects and interpretation of the subject were the

 7 The interview was conducted on Wednesday, December $10^{\rm th}$ 2014 at SMP Muhammadiyah 5 Surabaya.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

same. In this data, the use of the assessment rubrics was based on Curriculum 2013 since the government gave firm rules in the implementation of Curriculum 2013, while the assessment process in Cambridge Curriculum is flexible and does not contain detail rules like Curriculum 2013. The research finding was explained below.

a. The Use of the Assessment Rubrics in Assessing Attitude and Skill Competence

In assessing students' attitude, there are four ways settled by the government, some of them that use assessment rubrics are observation, self-assessment, and peer-assessment. The three ways should use assessment rubrics. According to Teacher A, each way had their own schedules in Curriculum 2013. The proportion was decided by the government, so was the use of the assessment rubrics. Teacher B, in addition, stated that the teacher could not use all the ways in assessing students' attitude in one particular time. It should be assessed based on the indicators of the assessment rubrics, so the teacher would decide whether he used assessment rubric through observation, self-assessment, or peer-assessment. If the teacher forced to include the assessment rubrics and use the assessment rubrics in assessing the competence through all those ways, he thought that it would be unreliable, just waste of time, and not maximal. In assessing students' attitude, especially, they could not be implemented in the same

time because the teacher should focus on teaching the learning materials. It was hard to assess each student's attitude competence since time allocation in one meeting was short and the teacher could not cover to assess all the students, even using the assessment rubrics. This matter was also applied in assessing students' skill.

b. The Use of the Assessment Rubrics Dealing with Time Allocation

Teacher A stated that the time allocation of conducting assessment was provided by the government. That was why she just followed the rules and used the assessment rubrics according to rules set up. In addition, teacher B informed that usually peer-assessment was conducted before the students took their daily test. The daily test was done after accomplishing 1 chapter. It was around 2 weeks. Each assessment had particular time. Even though the assessment rubrics of attitude and skill competence were used all in one particular time, the maximal result might not be achieved.

c. Frequency of the Use of the Assessment Rubrics and the Reasons in Determining It

In this study, the researcher asked Teacher A and Teacher B dealing with frequency of the use of the assessment rubrics and the reasons in determining it. Here, the researcher got information that the frequency also has been set up by the government in the Curriculum 2013. They usually

used the assessment rubrics according to those rules. Teacher B also stated that the use of the assessment rubrics should consider time left after giving learning materials. Because learning materials sometimes could not be accomplished in one meeting, the frequency in using the assessment rubrics also could not be exactly decided. To organize the time, Teacher B emphasized to use the assessment rubrics on *Kompetensi Inti* (core competence) 3 and 4. Core competence 1 and 2 were examined during or after the students did their tasks. In addition, Teacher B confirmed that he could use 1 or 2 assessment rubrics in one learning meeting.

d. Measuring the Students' Achievement and Progress

To measure the students' achievement and progress, the teachers used the result of the use of the assessment rubrics. They evaluated the use of the assessment rubrics. They decided which criteria of the assessment rubrics that students have mastered and which one (s) did not mastered yet. From those result, the teachers could measure the students' achievement and progress. In addition, Teacher B stated that they could be measured by examining the learning indicators. The assessment process and result should reflect the learning indicators.

e. Improving Students' Skill

In the case of improving students' skill, the teachers also used the result of the use of the assessment rubrics. After knowing the result, the teachers could determine the levels of each student. From here, the teachers could take action based on those levels in order to improve students' skill and ability.

Those are the research findings concerning on the use of the assessment rubrics in learning process. All of these data are further analyzed and interpreted on the discussion.

B. Discussion

1. The Development of the Assessment Rubrics

In this study, the discussion of the analysis result dealing with the development of the assessment rubrics through interview technique and documentation study were presented based on each indicator. They are:

a. Teachers' Understanding of Assessment Rubric

In this indicator, the understanding of English teachers of SMP Muhammadiyah 5 Surabaya about definition of assessment rubric is a little bit fuzzy. They stated that it used to assess the students' ability and to know the level of the students' achievement without clearly defined the role of assessment rubric as assessment instrument or tool. It is different from

definition of Linse that stated rubrics as "assessment instruments that help instructors communicate their expectations to students and focus on important criteria as they grade".

In the case of the importance of assessment rubric, Teacher A stated that assessment rubric provides assessment criteria. It was in line with the statement of Hafner and Hafner. The statement is dealing with the significance of providing assessment criteria. They stated that "when students have the assessment criteria in hand as they are completing a task, they are better able to critique their own performances". In addition, Teacher B stated that the assessment rubrics could give the teachers understanding about the aims of the learning assessment. It was emphasized by Stiggins' statement "if students know what the learning target is, they are better able to hit it". The benefits of rubrics are also highlighted by Wolf and Steve:

"rubrics make the learning target more clear, guide instructional design and delivery, make the assessment process more accurate and fair, provide students with a tool for self-assessment and peer feedback, have the potential to advance the learning of students of color, first generation students, and those from non-traditional settings" 11.

_

⁸ Angela R. Linse, *Creating Rubrics: Establishing Standards* (Temple University: Teaching and Learning Center), 1. http://www.temple.edu/tlc.

⁹ As cited in Kenneth Wolf and Ellen Steve, "The Role of Rubrics in Advancing and Assessing Student Learning". *The Journal of Effective Teaching*. Vol.7, No.1, 2007, 13

¹⁰ As cited in Kenneth Wolf and Ellen Steve, "The Role of Rubrics in Advancing and Assessing Student Learning"... 13

¹¹ Kenneth Wolf and Ellen Steve, "The Role of Rubrics in Advancing and Assessing Student Learning"... 13

b. Elements Developed by the Teachers in the Assessment Rubrics

English teachers of SMP Muhammadiyah 5 Surabaya did good choice in developing the assessment rubric criteria because Stevens and Levi who called criteria as dimension, stated that a good dimension rubric highlights students' skill and shows a fast indication of students' level after the students' tasks are graded. It can be seen from the way teacher develop the assessment criteria which is appropriate for the learning indicators.

c. Teachers' Considerations in Developing the Assessment Rubrics

The choice of teachers on students need, students' characteristic, and classroom condition as the considerations was good. Arter stated that the students' desire and need should draw the task given to the students, and it is defined by assessment rubric.

In addition, Teacher B also considered the learning aims and students' level. Here, Arter also stated that "effective tasks relate directly to the learning target, provide enough information to students so they know what to do, and avoid problems that might compromise students' ability to do their best work" 12.

1

¹² Judy Arter, *Creating & Recognizing Quality Rubrics* (Portland, Oregon: Pearson Assessment Training Institute, 2012), 28. www.ati.pearson.com

d. Combining Cambridge Curriculum and Curriculum 2013 Components in Developing the Assessment Rubrics

Combining Cambridge Curriculum and Curriculum 2013 components was difficult. It might be difficult because the assessment described in Cambridge Curriculum was different from Curriculum 2013. The teachers could only take some of the learning materials and teaching method of Cambridge Curriculum to be used together with Curriculum 2013. They chose some text materials that have similar topics. The firm time allocation also should be considered. Yet, the assessment rubrics developed by the teachers did not include the components of Cambridge Curriculum. The assessment process, and also assessment rubrics used were from Curriculum 2013. It was the weakness since the assessment rubrics used was only from Curriculum 2013. Meanwhile, Cambridge Curriculum implementation could not be measured maximally. Since the school implements Curriculum 2013, Cambridge Curriculum tends to be split curriculum at SMP Muhammadiyah 5 Surabaya.

e. Teachers' Steps in Developing the Assessment Rubrics

The way Teacher B emphasized the step in developing the assessment rubrics on the learning aims/goals was in a line with Vagle who stated that "a rubric, or proficiency level descriptor: describes the simple learning goals as the early or emerging levels of achievement, and describes

the more complex learning goals as the meets and exceeds levels of achievement, 13.

Based on this indicator, to know more detail about the ways teachers develop the assessment rubrics, the researcher examined the teachers' ways in developing the assessment rubrics. The analysis was done using Erlandson and Brophy's theory. From the research finding, the discussion was presented below.

The first stage was almost done by the teachers according to the theories. The way teachers choose an existing model to be developed was suitable with the theory which considered the quality of the assessment rubric models. The one to be considered was the teachers did not choose the assessment rubric models together with the students, while Erlandson stated that teachers should look at the assessment rubric models along with the students.

For the second stage, according to Erlandson, the criteria of assessment are the reflection of teachers and students' discussion of the assessment rubric models because the result of the discussion will give students understanding about the desire of the teachers, yet this matter did not appear in the step of developing the assessment rubrics done by English teachers of SMP Muhammadiyah 5 Surabaya. They created the assessment

-

¹³ Nicole Dimich Vagle, Creating Rubrics for Feedback and Assessment Design (Solution Tree Press), 2014. 2

rubric criteria by themselves. The weakness of the teachers in the second stage was they did not discuss the assessment criteria together with the students. They did not do it because they thought that discussing the assessment rubric criteria with the students were unnecessary to do. They prefer to create the assessment rubrics criteria on their own because they felt that it was rightful thing for the teachers¹⁴.

In the third stage, the teachers did the stage exemplary. The way they decide the number of levels in the assessment rubrics was appropriate with the theory.

In the fourth and fifth stages, the teachers did not conduct the stages; neither developing description of quality for each level of the criteria nor trying-out using the assessment rubrics. They argued that it would be waste of time if the teachers did it. The teachers have known the students' need and the learning aim so trying-out the assessment rubrics seemed to be needless. Moreover, it was different from Erlandson that believes developing description of quality for each level of the criteria and trying-out using the assessment rubrics as two of the main stages in developing assessment rubric.

In the last stage, Teacher A thought that the assessment rubrics revision was unnecessary, while Teacher B ensured that revising the

-

¹⁴ Interview result with the teachers on Wednesday, December 10th 2014 at SMP Muhammadiyah 5 Surabaya.

assessment rubrics was useful. According to Lombardi, revising an assessment rubric as needed can "record student information" 15. It should be good if Teacher A revised the assessment rubrics she developed.

Furthermore, there are two additional tips in developing assessment rubric. They are benchmarking assessment rubric, and sharing the assessment rubric to other English teachers and students. Brophy stated that an assessment rubric will not be meaningful to students until the benchmarks are available. Suskie also emphasized that "benchmarking compares a student's score against the scores of his peer" 16. It means that benchmarking is used to know the level of the students. It is one of the assessment aims. Here, Teacher A and Teacher B did not do this step. Probably, the teachers could know the level of the students from other methods. It can be a weakness of the teachers to leave benchmarking process, yet possibly this process can be skipped if the assessment rubrics developed by the teachers were in good level.

In sharing assessment rubric, Teacher A and Teacher B shared their assessment rubrics to other English teachers in the training program held by the school. Meanwhile, Teacher B tended to share only the criteria being assessed to the students in a spoken way. It was good point and better than Teacher A that did not consider to share her assessment rubrics, although

¹⁵ Marilyn M. Lombardi - Diana Oblinger. (Eds.), Making the Grade: The Role of Assessment in Authentic Learning (Educause Learning Initiative, 2008), 11.

¹⁶ As cited in Eric P. Soulsby, Assessment Note (Connecticut: University of Connecticut, 2009), 49.

Scott claims that "sharing and discuss contents of rubrics that will be used to assess an activity early in the process can give clear expectation" to the students¹⁷.

In conclusion, Teacher A should consider and improve some things deals with the steps in developing assessment rubric so that the assessment rubrics can be more effective to use. Those things are discussing the assessment criteria together with the students, developing description of quality for each level of the criteria, trying-out using the assessment rubrics, revising the assessment rubrics as needed, and benchmarking the assessment rubrics.

For Teacher B, the things to be considered and improved are discussing the assessment criteria together with the students, developing description of quality for each level of the criteria, trying-out using the assessment rubrics, and benchmarking the assessment rubrics.

f. Teachers' Strategies in Developing the Assessment Rubrics

Teacher A and Teacher B did not have any particular strategy in developing the assessment rubrics. Meanwhile, Orrell suggests that

"one useful design strategy is to take a generic assessment rubric that matches well with the assessment task objectives, discipline, level and other contextual setting, and adapt it for teachers own use, rewriting the attribute descriptions to reflect the course context, aims and

_

¹⁷ John Scott, *Authentic Assessment Tools* (Georgia: The University of Georgia), 41.

learning outcomes, and to apply to the specific assessment task"¹⁸.

It was so unfortunate since strategies is also important. The teachers should decide the suitable level of achievement that reflects the grading process and grading result. When the result comes, the teachers are able to measure if the learning aim can be achieved or not. That is why this point should be considered by the teachers.

g. Teachers' Obstacles and Solutions in Developing the Assessment Rubrics

In developing the assessment rubrics, one of the teachers faced an obstacle. The teacher gave an opinion that the different characteristic of Cambridge Curriculum and Curriculum 2013 gave him a problem to develop the assessment rubrics. Cambridge Curriculum which focuses on the grammar has more flexible assessment process. Meanwhile, Curriculum 2013 which emphasizes more on text materials tends to be firmer in the assessment process. Here, the assessment process would influence the ways teachers develop the assessment rubrics. The solution presented by the teacher was by taking some tasks from Cambridge book, yet using the assessment rubrics from Curriculum 2013. Because the learning aims and indicators were based on Curriculum 2013, it would not distract the

 18 As cited in Assessment Toolkit, Using Assessment Rubrics (USNW Australia, 2014), 2.

implementation of both curriculums, Cambridge Curriculum and Curriculum 2013, since Cambridge Curriculum has more flexible assessment process.

h. The Quality of the Assessment Rubrics Developed by the Teachers

Based on the result of the analysis through documentation study, the description about the assessment rubrics examined will be given. The grading rubric uses odd number of levels to represent a sense of balance of strengths and weaknesses. Strong level means that the assessment rubrics would need very little work to find them ready to use. Weak level implies that the assessment rubrics require a lot of work that it possibly is not worth the attempt, it is better to use another assessment rubric. Moreover, medium level is intended to describe levels of quality in an assessment rubric, not to compare those currently available. It could be that the typical currently available assessment rubric is closer to the weak level than to the medium one.

From the grading rubrics analysis, all the assessment rubrics examined were in the strong level. It means that the assessment rubrics would need very little work to find them ready to use. Here, the analysis examined each criterion and indicators in the grading rubric taken from Arter. The further explanation of each criterion and indicators were described below.

1) Criterion 1: coverage/organization

Coverage/organization as a first criterion is used to decide what teachers and students should do in order to succeed. The three indicators are provided in this criterion.

a) Indicator 1: covers the right content

There are three points in this indicator. The first point represents the best thinking that measures a straight relationship of the content standards and learning targets in an assessment rubric. Here, those 4 assessment rubrics examined were in strong level which meant that the teachers have represented the best thinking in the field about what it means to perform well on the skill or product under consideration.

The second point covers all essential features that create quality in a product or performance. Three of assessment rubrics examined were in strong level which aligned the content of rubric directly with the content standards/learning targets it is intended to assess. Meanwhile, in assessment rubric 2, there should be an improvement in this area.

For the third point, an assessment rubric should leave out all trivial or unrelated features. In assessment rubrics 1, 2, and 3, "Ring of truth"; support and extend teachers understanding about what they actually *do* look for when evaluating student work; were quite good,

but for the assessment rubric 4, Teacher B should think of some important dimension of a quality performance or product.

b) Indicator 2: criteria are well organized

This indicator focuses on examining the list of elements that describe quality. It should be possibly brief and managed into a functional form. It also involves classifying and clustering similar elements into criteria, and the relative contribution to the quality of the product or performance as a whole was represented to its relative significance given to each criterion. This indicator is divided into 4 points.

The first point covers good criteria (trait) structure. All the assessment rubrics examined, except assessment rubric 3, were in the strong level. This level shows that the assessment rubrics were divided into easily understandable criteria as needed, while the assessment rubric 3 needed to adjust the number of criteria. A single criterion could be made into three different criteria.

The second point examines the descriptors that put together should go together. Again, in this point, the assessment rubric 3 had different level. Weak level which represented mixed up descriptor should be considered by the teacher. Meanwhile, the assessment rubrics 1, 2, and 4 have to put the same descriptors and set them off together.

The third point points out the suitability of relative emphasis.

All the assessment rubrics showed that the relative emphasis on a variety of elements of performance was suitable. It was good result since the teachers could determine the suitability of relative emphasis.

The last point emphasizes on the independent of criteria (traits). Here, teacher A should work hard on making decision to has each significant feature appeared in only one place in her assessment rubric, so there was no redundancy occurred.

c) Indicator 3: number of levels fits targets and uses

The number of levels should be appropriate for the students and the use of the assessment rubrics. The levels should measure the students' achievement and give distinction among them. In this case, it was better for the teachers to combine the levels. The number of levels could be adjusted to be three levels. For young students, Erlandson suggest having only three levels in the assessment rubric.

2) Criterion 2: clarity

In the clarity criterion, assessment rubric should cover the significant dimensions of performance and describe them very well.

Clarity criterion has two indicators, they are:

a) Indicator 1: levels defined well

This indicator identifies levels so clearly so that the strong, medium, or weak levels agreed by people could be seen accurately. The instructional value of any assessment rubric also depended on the clarity of level descriptions. In this indicator, there are also five points identified.

Point 1 showed that all levels defined in the assessment rubrics examined were strong. It means that each level was defined with indicators and/or descriptor. There were no weaknesses of the teachers in this point.

Point 2 examines descriptive detail which avoids fuzzy words. Four assessment rubrics examined were in the medium level. It means that the teachers should improve their ability in defining terms, descriptors, and some key ideas to make clear meaning in their assessment rubrics.

Point 3 emphasizes on the rater agreement of assessment rubric. Assessment rubrics 1, 2, and 4 were in the strong level because they used levels provided by the government which had many users. The teachers who decided to use them were trained, and practiced to use them. Meanwhile, levels in the assessment rubric 3 should be fixed. Teacher B should consider this matter because from the rater agreement, the features of task in each level can be preciously seen.

The agreement of people working on the assessment rubrics can give usefulness in the assessment field.

Point 4 talks about avoiding counts. Here, the assessment rubrics 1, 2, and 3 were in the weak level which indicated that the teachers used rating based on counting the number or frequency of the assessment rubric levels. Working hard to change counting number or frequency of assessment rubrics levels into descriptive detail was really needed by Teacher A and Teacher B. Meanwhile, assessment rubric 4 were in the medium level which means that teacher B should change counting the number or frequency of assessment rubrics level into descriptive detail to avoid unclear quantitative words.

In addition, point 5 contains of examining words used in assessment rubrics. All the assessment rubrics were labeled as medium level. It indicates that the descriptive words were presented in Teacher A and Teacher B assessment rubrics, yet there were also some evaluative words found. Here, the teacher should get rid of the evaluative labels, and make them to be descriptive ones.

b) Indicator 2: levels parallel

Rubrics should consist of a parallel element of work on each level. In assessment rubrics 1, 2, and 4, the teachers discussed an indicator of quality in all levels. The way they gave clarity in presenting indicators of quality were exemplary. Meanwhile, Teacher

B should improve his understanding in this point. There was still an indicator at one level that was not presented at the other levels.

In conclusion, although the assessment rubrics were in the strong level, there were still improvements needed in some aspects. For Teacher A, she should improve the number of levels that fit targets and uses, the descriptive detail that avoid vague words, avoid counts, consider the wording, align criteria (traits), and independent criteria. For Teacher B, a good criteria (trait) structure should be improved, the descriptors put together should be gone together, the rater agreement should be gotten, the number of levels should be fitted into targets and uses, the descriptive detail should avoid vague words, the parallel levels should be presented, the ring of truth should be improved, the number or frequency, and the wording should be counted.

i. Trend in the Rating Result of the Assessment Rubrics Quality

In the table of the quality of the assessment rubrics below, a trend can be seen regarding to the clarity of the assessment rubrics and the number of levels fits targets and uses in the coverage/organization criterion.

Table 4.10

The Quality of the Assessment Rubrics Examined

Criterion			Result of Rating			
		Indicators	Assess ment Rubric 1	Assess ment Rubric 2	Assess ment Rubric 3	Assess ment Rubric 4
Coverage/		Represents best	5	5	5	5
Organization:		thinking				
Criteria cover		Aligns	5	3	5	5
the right		Ring of truth	5	5	5	3
content						
Coverage	/	Good criteria (trait)	5	5	3	5
Organization:		Structure				
Criteria (tr	aits)	Descriptors put	5	5	1	5
are well		toget <mark>her</mark> , go				
Organized		toget <mark>he</mark> r				
		Relative emphasis is right	5	5	5	5
		Criteria (traits) are independent	5	1	5	5
Coverage/Organization: Number of		3	3	3	3	
levels fits targets and uses						
Clarity:	All le	evels defined	5	5	5	5
Levels	Descriptive detail; avoids		3	3	3	3
		e words				
well Can		get rater agreement	5	5	1	5
		ds counts	1	1	1	3
Word		ling	3	3	3	3
Clarity: Levels are parallel			5	5	3	5

For further explanations, the discussion was described below.

In the number of levels fits targets and uses, the teachers tended to use five levels in their assessment rubrics. The teachers might feel that it was easier to use five levels in their assessment rubrics because those levels have

been provided by the government. However, the number of levels should have been appropriate for the intended learning target. Here, the users, the students and the teachers, should be able to differentiate each number of levels.

Meanwhile, the trend in the clarity criterion seemed clearer. The rating result of the assessment rubrics quality showed that the assessment rubrics seen from this area tended to be in the weak or medium level. The teachers often used evaluative or vague words and counting frequency of something rather than describe them in the form of words, adjective, and descriptive phrases. It probably occurred because the teachers found it easier to present the evaluative details since descriptive details are more time consuming. When they assess the students using the evaluative details, they could directly give the students final judgment from their own desire without considering some criteria.

It is different from the way when the descriptive details are used. In the descriptive details, there are some criteria that should be considered, and it was, indeed, time consuming if the teachers should examine all of the criteria. Here, the teachers should consider the use of the words in the assessment rubrics. The words used in assessment rubric can make clear desire of the teachers. When the teachers' desire can be seen, hopefully, the students will be able to improve their skill. Katims and Reeder stated that "When a scoring rubric gives judges this kind of more detailed, descriptive

information, it helps them know what to look for and enables them to classify what they see in a student product or performance" ¹⁹. It means that an assessment rubric using descriptive details will assist the teachers to identify and organize their expectation of the students' achievement in their tasks. To minimize this trend, the teachers can attempt to use descriptive details in the form of words, adjectives, and descriptive phrases in their assessment rubrics. This can be done by practicing more in this area.

2. The Use of the Assessment Rubrics in Learning Process

The last discussion in this chapter was about the result of the interview which had been conducted to two English teachers of SMP Muhammadiyah 5 Surabaya who develop the assessment rubrics. The interview was conducted to know the use of the assessment rubrics in the learning process. To know the use of the assessment rubrics in learning process, the researcher established some indicators. They are:

a. The Use of the Assessment Rubrics in Assessing Attitude and Skill Competence

The result of the interview showed that since the use of the assessment rubrics have been settled by the government, the assessment process also followed the rule from Curriculum 2013. However, the teachers

¹⁹ As cited in The Small Schools Project, *Planning Resources for Teachers in Small High Schools* (Seattle: Small Schools Project, 2003), 116.

_

thought they could not use all the assessment rubrics of attitude and skill competence in one particular time/lesson. They thought all the assessment rubrics from observation, self-assessment, and peer-assessment could be used if the learning indicators were suitable with the learning materials. The time allocation and proportion also have been scheduled by the government. If all assessment rubrics were used in one particular time, the teachers would find them unreliable and did not give maximal result.

The crucial thing to be considered was assessing students' attitude through the three ways tended to be difficult because time allocation provided was short. In addition, the teachers should focus on teaching the learning materials first. It also occurred in the use of the assessment rubrics in assessing students' skill competence through practice test, project test, and portfolio assessment. Here, the teachers should decide the use of the assessment rubrics smartly.

b. The Use of the Assessment Rubrics Dealing with Time Allocation

The time allocation in using the assessment rubrics for assessing attitude and skill competence were provided by the government, the teachers just followed those rules. It was disadvantageous for the students and the teachers since the teachers could not give their best because of the strict time allocation.

c. Frequency of the Use of the Assessment Rubrics and the Reasons in Determining It

The frequency of the use of the assessment rubrics also has been provided by the government, yet Teacher B emphasized in using the assessment rubrics for measuring Core Competence 3 and 4. Meanwhile, the use of the assessment rubrics in assessing Core Competence 1 and 2 were used during or after the students did their tasks. It could be hard for the teachers because they could not assess the students using the assessment rubrics as they want and need. The only good point from Teacher B was that he tried to assess the students based on all Core Competence though the frequency has been set up by the government.

d. Measuring the Students' Achievement and Progress

Teacher A and Teacher B used the assessment rubrics to improve their students' achievement and progress. They did it by examining the result of the use of the assessment rubrics. The evaluation of the use of the assessment rubrics was also done. The criteria have been mastered by the students would be an indication to measure their achievement. In the best form of the assessment rubrics, Arter mentions that "rubrics help boosts the very achievement they are used to assess by defining so clearly what it is students are to learn"²⁰. In addition, learning indicators was also examined

²⁰ Judy Arter, Creating & Recognizing Quality Rubrics... 1, www.ati.pearson.com

by Teacher B to know if the assessment process and the assessment rubrics result could reflect the learning indicators. Here, the students' achievement and progress could also be seen since Whittaker, Salend, and Duhaney stated that the use of assessment rubrics can help teachers "assess process, performance, and progress". These were good choice from the teachers considering the importance of the result of the assessment rubrics use in the learning process.

e. Improving Students' Skill

The teachers had some ways to improve their students' skill. After knowing the result of the use of the assessment rubrics, the teachers would find the most appropriate strategy based on each students level to be implemented in the learning process so that the students' skill and ability will improve. Moreover, Creighton stated that "rubrics are tools designed to provide constructive feedback for students through self-, peer, or teacher assessment in order to further develop skills or knowledge". It should be good since the students would get the benefit of the result of the assessment rubrics use.

_

²¹ As cited in Jennifer Turner - Elizabeth Shellard, *Developing and Using Instructional Rubrics* (Arlington: Educational Research Service, 2004), 1.

²² As cited in The Capacity Building Series, *Student Self-Assessment* (Ontario: The Literacy and Numeracy Secretary, 2007), 6.