



The Effect of Initial Knowledge and Achievement Motivation on the Learning Result of Narrative Essay Writing in English

Yovi Bathesta[✉]

Institute of Communication and Business LSPR, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History :

Received August 2020

Accepted September 2020

Published December 2020

Keywords:

Initial Knowledge,
Achievement Motivation,
Narrative Essay Writing,
Analytical Rubric, Holistic
Rubric

Abstract

The objective of this research is to study the effects of the Initial Knowledge in English and the Achievement Motivation in English language on the Learning Result in Narrative Essay Writing in English. The research methodology used is a quasi-experiment with 2 x 2 factorial design which consists of the Initial Knowledge (A) and the Achievement Motivation factors (B) as independent variables, formed from 2 levels (A1, A2) and (B1, B2). The Learning Results are scored by Analytical Rubric (Y1) and Holistic Rubric (Y2) as dependent variables. The analysis of the research is by 1) Descriptive Statistics & Test (Test for Equality of Means) and 2) Multivariate Analysis of Variance. The population is the first semester students of Academic Year 2014-2015 of The London School of Public Relations (LSPR)-Jakarta, while the samples are taken from 2 classes of the lowest and the highest levels of English based on the LSPR English entry test. The Achievement Motivation questionnaires were distributed to the samples, from which 112 respondents' answers were collected. The research concludes that based on the MONOVA, the Initial Knowledge significantly influences the mean scores of the bivariate Analytical Rubric and the Holistic Rubric, while the Achievement Motivation in English doesn't. And, the factors together, and the interaction between those two factors significantly influences those two bivariate variables.

✉ Correspondence :

Intiland Tower, Jl. Jend. Sudirman No.Kav. 32, RT.3/RW.2, Karet
Tengsin, Kecamatan Tanah Abang, Kota Jakarta Pusat, Daerah
Khusus Ibukota Jakarta 10250
E-mail: yovi.b@lspr.edu

p-ISSN 2085-4943

e-ISSN 2502-4469

INTRODUCTION

The scientific writing capability in English in higher education in Indonesia is considered to be very low, based on seven years of English teaching experience in some higher institutions in Jakarta, knowing to compete internationally in the economics, political, social, cultural, and educational fields, a proficient English writing capability is a must. The credibility of a higher education institute is accounted for by the scientific products of its students and lecturers.

This research studies the effect of Initial Knowledge and Achievement Motivation in English on the Learning Result of Narrative Essay Writing in English, assessed by Analytical and Holistic Rubrics.

The Learning Result of Narrative Essay Writing is the output by a student after having passed a conscious cognitive learning process within a certain time set by an institution, which could be influenced by many factors. The learning result is the product of the support of a teacher towards a learner on his/her knowledge/skill/problem-solving capabilities in his/her Zone Proximity Development (ZPD) of Narrative Essay Writing in English (Ormrod, 2008).

Narrative Essay Writing in English is characterized by writing elements, which are the Six Traits: Content or Ideas, Organization, Voice, Word Choice, Sentence Fluency, and Conventions (Cox, 2016). A Narrative Essay could be personal or scientific related to experience, history, past, a current phenomenon development, and a prediction for future reference, written chronologically by using the pronoun of the 1st and 3rd person (Jordan, 1999; Oshima and Hogue, 2007).

Narrative Essay Writing in English is used in most parts of the world for all aspects in social, political, technological and economics fields, such as communication, transformation technology, maritime, aviation, entertainment, radio, and diplomacy.

English is also the official language for the United Nations, or a global or international language (Dictionary Reference, English, 2012). It has now become an individual property since it no longer belongs to those whose English is their mother tongue (inner circle), but also to those who use it as their second language (middle circle), and even those not included in these two circles (outside circle), (Crystal, 1999; Harmer, 2012).

In the field of education, Narrative Essay Writing in English is a must for scientific written work: journals, research, reports, etc. The need for writing in English has become a higher priority every year. Therefore, it is necessary to be proficient in English Narrative Essay Writing, with English proficiency being a key to a global success.

Initial knowledge in English is the language that has been previously acquired before the planned new knowledge to be taught or transferred in certain forms, introduced or accessed, or already stored in long term memory. Initial Knowledge could be obtained through a test, expert judgment, observation, interview, and survey to collect data about the target audience, learning goal objective, and also a scaffolding for the coming knowledge (Dick, Lou, and Carey, 2005)

A person's Initial Knowledge in English could be judged on the extent he/she understands English grammar and listening. English grammar encompasses noun, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions and determiners, types of sentences and phrases, active and passive voices, direct and indirect speeches, subject-verb concordance, sequence of tenses, phrasal verbs, sentence transformation, sentence synthesis, common errors, and the like (McDougal, 2016; Lim, 2014), while listening encompasses the understanding of someone in a story or information related to grammar, diction, etc. The result of the Initial Knowledge Test is the base for an English teacher to plan and design future learning so that students will understand new learning material easier, faster and better.

Achievement Motivation in English is the power, energy, or strong will that comes from inside

of a person to learn English. The power is the vehicle to achieve a more challenging target, hope or goal by striving to negotiate various obstacles to reach a higher attainment than others within the frame of the standard of excellence. Achievement Motivation in English is different from one person to another and thus depends on the need of the individual, which is influenced by his/her requirements and surroundings (Djaali, 2012; Santrock, 2014).

Assessing is the process of collecting data/information to evaluate as a base for decision making about a learner, curriculum development, and educational policy, used by both teacher and learner during the learning instruction (Naga, 2007). One of the assessments is the use of a criteria based-test, called a rubric.

A Rubric is a printed evaluation tool that contains a series of guidance/criteria to evaluate work, product or performance such as written papers, speech, problem-solving, portfolio, and case studies. It uses a detailed description of the work standard which describes continuum work quality from the best to the worst and helps a teacher/evaluator to rank the students' responses, based on the stated criteria. A Rubric is also a tool to obtain a consistent score for all learners (Guskey and Marzano, 2001; Butler and Munn, 2016; Jacobsen et al, 2009). There are two kinds of Rubrics: Analytical and Holistic Rubrics (Mertler, 2012).

An Analytical Rubric is used more for formative testing because this rubric: (1) breaks up the characteristics of a product or a process, (2) demonstrates components of each characteristic, (3) demonstrates descriptors of each component based on the rank/work level/score, (4) sums the score of each component to calculate the total score (Nitko, 1996). An assessment using the Analytical Rubric could provide detailed and consistent feedback; however, it takes longer to score the completed work (Zimmaro, 2003).

An assessment using Holistic Rubric is more suitable for assessing a summative test because this rubric: (1) demonstrates learners' work quality as a

whole in one score, (2) differs no level of performance for each criterion, (3) does not provide detailed information, and (4) is quick in scoring the work being assessed (Mueller, 2015; Nitko, 1996). The result of the writer's thesis shows that the Holistic Rubric scores are more consistent than that of the Analytical Rubric because the scores of a Holistic Rubric have a smaller variance since one score covers all criteria, while scores of the Analytical Rubric have a larger variance since the learner's score is a sum of the scores of each criterion (Bathesta, 2010).

The general goal of this research is to understand the effect of the Initial Knowledge and the Achievement Motivation on the bivariate scores Learning Result, namely the Analytical Rubric (Y1) and the Holistic Rubric (Y2).

METHOD

The research methodology used in this research is a quasi-experiment with a 2 x 2 factorial design, where the first factor is Initial Knowledge (A) consisting of High Initial Knowledge (A=1) and Low Initial Knowledge (A=2), and the second factor is the Achievement Motivation (B) consisting of High Motivation (B=1) and Low Motivation (B=2) with dependent variables which consist of the Learning Result of Narrative Essay Writing in English, assessed by the Analytical Rubric (Y1) and the Holistic Rubric (Y2). The testing hypotheses use a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) with a 2 x 2 factorial design (Agung, 2011).

The research population is all first semester students of The London School of Public Relations – Jakarta (LSPR), from 2 classes with a High Initial Knowledge in English and 2 others with a Low Initial Knowledge in English as samples, students' genders are not taken into consideration.

The grouping for the high and low levels in English is based on the LSPR English entry test for grammar and listening. An Analytical Rubric is introduced by the English lecturers from the first semester. In this research, there are two kinds of assessment tests used, namely the Analytical Rubric and the Holistic Rubric, by relating them to the level

of Initial Knowledge and Achievement Motivation in Narrative Essay Writing in English.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistical

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistical summary of the Analytical Rubric (Y1) and the Holistic Rubric (Y2) by the two factors; Initial Knowledge (A) and Achievement Motivation (B). Based on this summary, the following findings are presented.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistical Summary of the Analytical Rubric (Y1) and the Holistic Rubric (Y2) by the two factors Initial Knowledge (A) and Achievement Motivation (B).

Descriptive Statistics for Y1							
A	B	Mean	Median	Max	Min.	Std. Dev.	Obs.
1	1	58.1053	58	94	26	17.8882	19
1	2	52.2813	45	98	29	17.0071	32
2	1	20.2162	16	57	5	10.3605	37
2	2	20.9167	18	41	10	9.1267	24
All		35.9554	33.5	98	5	21.8411	112

Descriptive Statistics for Y2							
A	B	Mean	Median	Max	Min.	Std. Dev.	Obs.
1	1	57.8947	50	90	30	16.7760	19
1	2	52.0625	50	95	25	18.3952	32
2	1	19.0811	20	50	5	10.7429	37
2	2	20.0000	20	50	5	11.9782	24
All		35.2857	30	95	5	22.6713	112

1. The group who have High Initial Knowledge (A=1) and High Achievement Motivation (B=1), their Analytical Rubric (Y1) mean score = 58.1053 which is higher than those who have High Initial Knowledge (A=1) and Low Motivation (B=2) at 52.2813.
2. The group who have Low Initial Knowledge (A=2) and High Achievement Motivation (B=1), their Analytical Rubric (Y1) mean score = 20.2162 which is lower than those who have Low Initial Knowledge and Low Motivation (B=2) at 20.9167.
3. The group who have High Achievement Motivation (B=1) and High Initial Knowledge (A=1), their Analytical Rubric (Y1) mean score = 58.1053 which is higher than those who have High Motivation Achievement (B=1) and Low Initial Knowledge (A=2) at 20.2162.
4. The group who have Low Motivation (B=2) and High Initial Knowledge (A=1), their Analytical Rubric (Y1) mean scores = 52.2813 which is higher than those who have Low Initial Knowledge (A=2) and Low Initial Knowledge (A=2) at 20.9167.
5. The group who have High Initial Knowledge in English (A=1) and High Achievement Motivation (B=1), their Holistic Rubric (Y2) mean score = 57.8947 which is higher than those who have High Initial Knowledge (A=1) and Low Motivation in English (B=2) at 52.0625.
6. The group who have Low Initial Knowledge (A=2) and High Achievement Motivation (B=1), their Holistic Rubric (Y2) mean score = 19.0811 which is lower than those who have Low Initial Knowledge (A=2) and Low Motivation (B=2) at 20.9167.
7. The group who have High Achievement Motivation (B=1) and High Initial Knowledge (A=1) and Low Initial Knowledge, their Holistic Rubric (Y2) mean score = 57.8947 which is higher than those who have High Motivation Achievement (B=1) and Low Initial Knowledge (A=2) at 19.0811.
8. The group who have Low Motivation (B=2) and High Initial Knowledge (A=1), their Holistic Rubric (Y2) mean score = 52.0625 which is higher than those who have Low

Motivation (B=2) and Low Initial Knowledge (A=2) at 20.0000.

Hypotheses Testing

Factor A and/or Factor B influence both Y1 and Y2 simultaneously as dependent variables, that are bivariate (Y1, Y2).

A. To test the hypotheses 1, the following One-Way MANOVA model of Analytical Rubric (Y1) and Holistic Rubric (Y2) on the factor Initial Knowledge (A) is applied.

$$Y1 = C(10) + C(11)*(A=1) + \epsilon1$$

$$Y2 = C(20) + C(21)*(A=1) + \epsilon2$$

Hypothesis 1

The Initial Knowledge in English affects the bivariate Analytical Rubric (Y1) and the Holistic Rubric (Y2), with the following statistical hypothesis.

$$H0: C(11) = C(21) = 0 \text{ vs } H1: \text{Otherwise (1)}$$

B. To test the hypotheses 2, the following One-Way MANOVA model of Analytical Rubric (Y1) and Holistic Rubric (Y2) on the factor Motivation (B) is applied.

$$Y1 = C(30) + C(31)*(B=1) + \epsilon3$$

$$Y2 = C(40) + C(41)*(B=1) + \epsilon4$$

Hypothesis 2

The Achievement Motivation in English (B) affects the bivariate Analytical Rubric (Y1) and Holistic Rubric (Y2), with the following statistical hypothesis.

$$H0: C(31) = C(41) = 0 \text{ vs } H1: \text{Otherwise (2)}$$

C. To test the hypotheses 3 and 4, the following Two-Way MANOVA model of the Analytical Rubric (Y1) and Holistic Rubric (Y2) on the factors Initial Knowledge (A) and Motivation in English (B) is applied;

$$Y1 = C(11)*(A=1)*(B=1) + C(12)*(A=1)*(B=2) + C(13)*(A=2)*(B=1) + C(14)*(A=2)*(B=2) + \epsilon5$$

$$Y2 = C(21)*(A=1)*(B=1) + C(22)*(A=1)*(B=2) + C(23)*(A=2)*(B=1) + C(24)*(A=2)*(B=2) + \epsilon6$$

Hypothesis 3

The factors of Initial Knowledge and Achievement Motivation have a joint effect on the bivariate Analytical Rubric and Holistic Rubric, with the following statistical hypothesis.

$$H0: C(11) = C(12) = C(13) = C(14), C(21) = C(22) = C(23) = C(24) \text{ vs}$$

$$H1: \text{Otherwise (3)}$$

Hypothesis 4

The interaction between the factors of Initial Knowledge and Achievement Motivation (A*B) has a joint effect on the bivariate Analytical Rubric and Holistic Rubric, with the following statistical hypothesis.

$$H0: C(11) - C(12) - C(13) + C(14) = C(21) - C(22) - C(23) + C(24) = 0 \text{ vs}$$

$$H1: \text{Otherwise (4)}$$

Table 2. Summary of the Wald Tests of the effects of the factor Initial Knowledge (A) or the factor Achievement Motivation (B) on the bivariate of the Analytical Rubric (Y1) and the Holistic Rubric (Y2)

Hypothesis	Chi-Square	Df	Prob.	Conclusion
(1)	326.2342	2	0.0000	(a)
(2)	3.99644	2	0.1356	(b)
(3)	646.7990	6	0.0000	(a)
(4)	116.655.	2	0.0000	(a)

(a) The data supports the hypothesis at 1% level of significance.

(b) The data does not support the hypothesis at the 10% level

Discussion

Based on the summary of the Wald Tests presented in Table 2, this study presents the following conclusions and implications.

Testing of Hypothesis 1

At the 1% level of significance, the mean scores of the bivariate Analytical Rubric and Holistic Rubric have a significant difference between the students having High Initial Knowledge and Low Initial Knowledge.

Besides, the statistical result of the system equation also shows that the mean of each Analytical Rubric and Holistic Rubric for the students having High Initial Knowledge is significantly higher than for the students having Low Initial Knowledge.

Based on the Chi-square statistics of $\chi_0^2 = 326,3242$, with $df = 2$ and $p\text{-value} = 0.0000 < 0.01$. the initial Knowledge in English has significant effect on the bivariate Analytical and Holistic Rubrics. This means that the data supports the hypothesis and implies that both the Analytical and Holistic Rubrics are very useful in mapping the weak areas of students, from which they should be motivated to learn to help them improve their capability in writing and thus reach their target. Both Rubrics also assist a teacher to map the weak language areas of the class and enables him/her to guide the students to reach the target of the faculty. The group having High Initial Knowledge has a good foundation in the language enabling them to progress on to further learning materials. The usage of both Rubrics will, therefore, assist them to reach a higher score. For the group having Low Initial Knowledge, both Rubrics will guide them in their learning process, although they will not progress as fast as that of the group having High Initial Knowledge.

Testing of Hypothesis 2

At the 10% level of significance, the mean scores of the bivariate Analytical Rubric and Holistic Rubric have an insignificant difference between the students having High Motivation and Low Motivation.

In the learning result of English, the effect of the Learning Motivation in English on the bivariate Analytical and Holistic Rubrics is insignificant based on the Chi-Square Test statistic of $\chi_0^2 = 3.996444$, with $df = 2$ and $p\text{-value} = 0.1356 > 0.10$. So, the data does not support the hypothesis.

Some possibilities are causing this insignificant difference: 1) the group of students having High Motivation might have Low Initial Knowledge in English, or 2) vice versa, the group of students having Low Motivation might have High Initial Knowledge in English. Achievement Motivation is strongly driven from the inner side of a person in achieving a goal or target. Achievement Motivation is different from one person to another. It depends on one's needs and is also influenced by personal and environmental factors regardless of whether they are assessed by either the Analytical or Holistic Rubrics.

Testing of Hypothesis 3

At the 1% level of significance, the factors of Initial Knowledge and Achievement Motivation together have an effect on the bivariate Learning Result as assessed by the Analytical Rubric and Holistic Rubric.

Based on the Chi-Square Test statistic of $\chi_0^2 = 646.7990$, with $df = 6$ and $p = 0.0000 < 0.01$, the Initial Knowledge and Achievement Motivation have a significant joint effects on the bivariate Analytical and Holistic Rubrics. Hence, the data supports the hypothesis. This conclusion implies that Initial Knowledge and Achievement Motivation together have significantly affected the bivariate variable Learning Result, assessed by the Analytical Rubric and Holistic Rubric. The Initial Knowledge, theoretically, is a skill possessed before the future skill/lesson to be taught, while the Achievement Motivation is the power, energy or strength that will come from inside a person to reach a target which is more challenging and needs a continued effort to successfully negotiate various obstacles. When both factors are studied together using the Analytical and Holistic Rubrics, the Learning Result will be significant because both

Rubrics describe the component of the criteria on the continuum scores.

Testing of Hypothesis 4

At the 1% level of significance, the interaction between the factors of Initial Knowledge and Achievement Motivation has jointly a significant effect on the bivariate Learning Result as assessed by the Analytical Rubric and Holistic Rubric.

Based on the Chi-Square Test statistic of $\chi_0^2 = 116,655$ with $df = 2$ and $p = 0.0000 < 0.01$. the interaction between the factors of Initial Knowledge and Achievement Motivation have a significant joint effect on the Learning Result using the assessment of the Analytical and Holistic Rubrics. Hence, the data supports the hypothesis.

In other words, the effect of Initial Knowledge on the scores of the bivariate Learning Result, assessed by the Analytical Rubric and Holistic Rubric is significant depending on Achievement Motivation.

The initial Knowledge, theoretically, is a skill possessed before a new skill is taught, while the Achievement Motivation is the power, energy or strength that will come from inside of a person, to reach a target or hope which is more challenging implying effort to pass through various obstacles. When both factors are studied together using the Analytical and Holistic Rubrics, they will be significant.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion

Initial Knowledge in English is the knowledge that has existed or been previously acquired before the planned new knowledge to be taught or transferred by certain methods, introduced or accessed, or already stored in long term memory (Dick, Lou, and Carey, 2005).

Achievement Motivation in English is the power, energy, or strength that will come from inside of a person to learn English. Achievement Motivation in English is different from one person

to another, thus it depends on the need of the individual, and is influenced by his/her requirements and surroundings (Djaali, 2012; Santrock, 2014).

Improvement of the existing surrounding factors might help students increase their Learning Results in English and need to be taken into account in this research, among others are:

Class layout

The class chair layout is set traditionally in a row and this kind of layout is suitable for each student to do individual tasks. For learning English, this style of layout is not suitable since the teacher is unable to converse directly with the students, increase the communication intensity, encourage active student participation in the class, gain the attention of students, and set student pair or group work.

A conducive atmosphere in class supports the productivity of students and encourages them to interact, especially in the process of English teaching-learning, where there is a need for students to interact among themselves and with their teacher. The class environment will be better supported with a semi-circle layout because it enables students to work with peers, and allows the teacher to easily give directions to students.

According to Ormrod, a conducive class is where the teacher can interact directly, help the students when need be and observe any confusion, frustration, or boredom among the students. According to Jacobsen, Eggen, and Kauchak, the traditional layout of a row of chairs and tables solely focuses attention on the teacher and reduces communication intensity among students and between the teacher and students.

Class size

The number of students per class in LSPR ranges from 30 – 40. This number does not allow the teacher to interact easily with students and monitor grammar usage and pronunciation. Furthermore, physically, classroom walls and ceilings are not soundproofed. In a big class, it is

difficult for a teacher to give individual guidance not to mention the time limitations. This is especially important for learning English as a smaller class size would be more effective. According to Parson, Hinson and Sardo-Brown, the number of students in the class will affect the education climate and behavior of those who are attending the class. Furthermore, the class size will affect the capability of the teacher in managing the class successfully.

Learning session frequency

Learning English as a foreign language one session a week cannot be very effective, especially in big classes with Low Initial Knowledge in English. Two or more sessions per week would be more conducive to the learning process for students intending to acquire the language elements necessary for successful English communication.

Teacher's guidance out of class

Giving guidance to a student who needs to improve his command of the English language is necessary because of the limited time in the classroom, especially for those who have Low Initial Knowledge. Unfortunately, the English teachers in LSPR do not have enough time for their students after class because they have 12 English Classes to teach per week, as well as scoring students assignments, checking students' abstracts, and other related English tasks. The students' assignments are returned to the students in a week to be discussed in class. This situation limits the interaction of the teacher-students after class and is further compounded by student motivation to stay longer on campus after the class.

Recommendation

London School of Public Relations and other higher institutions

To improve student learning result in English, these are some suggestions to be taken into account:

1. To provide English class matriculation for students who have a low score in the entry test before the academic year starts;

2. To form smaller classes for English language learning so that teacher- students have more opportunities to converse and interact to improve;
3. To increase the guiding frequency between teacher – students after the class so that those who are low in English have enough assistance which will further motivate them to learn.
4. To develop extracurricular activities to facilitate students to improve their English.

Future Research

For future researchers, it is recommended to take into account the factors below in conducting research on the Learning Result of Narrative Essay Writing in English:

1. The students' understanding of the importance of English as a global language.
2. English class matriculation for students having low standards in English before the academic year starts.
3. The factor of class size determines the level of communication and interaction intensity among students, and between them and the teacher.
4. A class management and ecology that should enable teacher – students to continuously interact and be interdependent; a specific environment with learning activities that can be conducive to class experience, such as physical components including classroom furniture, etc. A classroom should be a social environment enabling students to feel safe, accepted and comfortable. Such an environment should encourage students to take risks when learning new things and ask for help to gain higher achievement.
5. Class management is assigned in an orderly manner to be useful and fully optimized for all students, by reminding them of the desired behavior and help them avoid breaking class rules.

REFERENCES

- Agung, I. G. N. (2011). Cross section and experimental data analysis using eViews. John Wiley & Sons.
- Bathesta, Y. (2010). Komparasi Konsistensi antara Hasil Penilaian menggunakan Asesmen Rubrik Holistik dan Analitik atas Penulisan

- Esai dalam Bahasa Inggris. [Thesis, Universitas Negeri Jakarta]
- Butler, S.M., & Munn, N. D. (2005). How to assess students' performance to enhance learning. Serve Center. www.serve.org/uploads/publications/asses-science.pdf (accessed, 2 October 2016).
- Cox, J. (2016). Six traits of writing: characteristics, definitions, and activities of each component. About, Inc.
- Crystal, D. (1999). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of English Language. Cambridge University Press.
- Dick, W., Lou, C., & Carey, J.O. (2005). The systematic design of instruction. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data. Dictionary Reference, English.
- Djaali. (2012). Psikologi pendidikan. Bumi Aksara.
- Guskey, T.R., & Marzano, R.J. (2001). Scoring rubrics in the classroom. Corwin Press, Inc., 2001.
- Harmer, J. (2012). Essential teacher knowledge: Core concepts in English Language Teaching. Pearson Education Limited.
- Jacobsen, D.A. et al. (2009). Metode-metode pengajaran. PustakaPelajar.
- Jamaris, M. (2010). Orientasi Batu dalam Psikologi Pendidikan. Yayasan Penamas Putri.
- Jordan, R. R. (1999). Academic writing course. Pearson Education Limited.
- Lim, T.C. (2014). Strengthen English grammar for secondary levels. Singapore Asia Publishers Pte. Ltd.
- Ormrod, J.E. (2008). Educational psychology: Developing learners. Pearson Education Inc.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2007). Introduction to academic writing. Pearson Longman.
- McDougal, H. (2016). Six traits for writing middle school. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company.
- Mertler, C.A. (2012). "Practical assessment, research & evaluation, designing rubrics for your classroom." <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=25>, h.1 (accessed, 26 September 2012).
- Naga, D.S. (2007). Teori tes: Buku I. Pascasarjana, Universitas Negeri Jakarta.
- Nitko, A.J. (1996). Educational assessment of students. Prentice-Hall, Ins.
- Santrock, J.W. (2014). Psikologi pendidikan. Salemba Humanika.
- Zimmaro, D.M. (2003). Developing grading rubrics. Measurement and Evaluation Centre, The University of Texas.