



AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT'S ERROR IN WRITING ABILITY THROUGH DESCRIPTIVE TEXT OF VII GRADE OF SMP N 4 TAKENGON

Muhammad Hasyimsyah Batubara¹, Delfia Herwanis², Safitriana³

^{1,2,3}IAIN Takengon, Aceh Tengah, Aceh, Indonesia

Email: muhammad.hasyimsyahbatubara@gmail.com^{1,3}, delfiaherwanis3@gmail.com²

Abstract: The research is interested in analyzing and focusing on students' errors in writing descriptive text such as developing ideas, organizing ideas, grammar, mechanics, and using vocabulary better. This research aims to analyze the errors in writing students of descriptive text in the VII grade of SMP N 4 Takengon. This research used a qualitative method, technique of collecting data by observation, interview, and documentation. Based on the result, the writer concluded: After researching and analyzing the data, the writer concludes as the kinds of errors in writing students of descriptive text at VII grade of SMP N 4 Takengon are from three aspects they are adjective, conjunction, and present tense. The finding shows the total error of students in writing adjectives, which is 23 students. In the total error of students in writing conjunctions, there were 24 students. The total error of students in writing the present tense, which is 21 students. If it is related to the student's error statement in writing, the value of about 94% and 166.6% total wrong word in error because students' understanding is still low about writing.

Keywords: Writing Ability, Descriptive Text

Abstrak: Penelitian ini fokus menganalisis kesalahan siswa dalam menulis teks deskriptif seperti mengembangkan ide, menyusun ide, tata bahasa, mekanika, dan menggunakan kosakata dengan lebih baik. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis macam-macam kesalahan menulis teks deskriptif siswa kelas VII SMP N 4 Takengon. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif, teknik pengumpulan data dengan observasi, wawancara, dan dokumentasi. Berdasarkan hasil penelitian, peneliti menyimpulkan: Setelah meneliti dan menganalisis data, peneliti menyimpulkan bahwa jenis-jenis kesalahan menulis teks deskriptif siswa kelas VII SMP N 4 Takengon berasal dari tiga aspek yaitu kata sifat, kata sambung, dan present tense. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan kesalahan total siswa dalam menulis kata sifat, yaitu 23 siswa. Total kesalahan siswa dalam penulisan kata hubung ada 24 siswa. Jumlah kesalahan siswa dalam penulisan present tense yaitu 21 siswa. Jika dikaitkan dengan pernyataan kesalahan siswa dalam menulis nilainya sekitar 94% dan 166.6% total kesalahan kata karena pemahaman siswa tentang menulis masih rendah.

Kata Kunci: Kemampuan Menulis, Teks Deskriptif

INTRODUCTION

In the English language, writing competence is one of the four language skills considered an arduous field to master. It is a fundamental language element to help students improve language competence, literacy, and develop cognitive skills, students' thinking in the academic realm (Bacha, 2002; Behizadeh & Engelhard, 2011 in Birhan, 2018; Fang et al., 2010). Furthermore, the writing process will help shape and develop conceptual understanding, but to achieve this is a compound activity that requires organizing, clarifying, and articulating knowledge. The writer must have several supporting aspects such as choosing useful vocabulary, punctuation, perfect spelling, writing strong content, organization, and purpose of writing. Writing is obtained from determination, persistence, plain hard, sweat, and direct practice (Langan, 2010). This explanation clarifies that when someone starts writing something for the first time, he has already planned and thought about what he will say and how he will put it. After this step

is completed, he should re-read what he has written and provide corrections and corrections to the writing that has been completed. It is a process of coherent and cohesive positioning of ideas into a well-written text. The steps and actions that do not stand alone in writing are sometimes significant obstacles for novice writers.

According to the research findings of 2011, it shows that students' writing assessments are merely 1% of language students who meet expectations at the professional extent of writing, and 65% are below the necessary level of writing (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011). Furthermore, the findings data show the ability of eighth-graders who speak English as a first language, merely 23% of students are at the professional extent in writing, and the results are even worse for students whose first language is not English (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). To forge and improve one's writing skills should start from school. Students need to be encouraged to develop writing skills by learning to write in schools. Students must be trained to write the appropriate words and stimulate the ability to present ideas to readers about their writing ideas. The teacher's role is vital here, hoping to create the teaching and learning activity of writing texts increasingly interesting. Without proper instructional support and guidance, the writing ability of L2 learners to learn science may not be achieved (Martin & Rose, 2005; de Oliveira & Lan, 2014 in Kim and D. Kim, 2021). In writing skills, several types of existing texts are introduced to students to learn and deepen. Among others is the strengthening of descriptive text, and this style is a type of content used to portray something, such as describing a person, place, or event. Then, the descriptive body is ordinarily packaged in a simple present tense form.

From the previous explanation and the researcher's experience of seeing students' writing skills in the field with the many mistakes students made, the researcher plans to analyze student errors and diagnose the difficulties they experience learning to write in class. Writing and writing evaluation is a complex process required in the development of substantial knowledge and meta-knowledge about language, text, genre, composition, and communication (Elton, 2010; Reiff & Bawarshi, 2011; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013; Olinghouse, Graham, & Gillespie, 2015; Wang & Engelhard, 2019 in Roscoe et al., 2020). To see skills, detect and assess errors in writing, there are many ways and aspects that can be used, such as rules for spelling, grammar, and punctuation (Devitt, 2004; Hyland, 2007; Hacker & Sommers, 2016 in Roscoe et al., 2020).

Therefore, the researcher uses error analysis to identify it, hoping that the research results will improve writing learning methods. In the future, students' mistakes in learning to write will be minimized, especially in SMP N 4 Takengon. Error analysis is an action to identify, classify, interpret, and describe the errors faced by students, and the goal is to obtain information about the difficulties students usually face in writing English sentences. Furthermore, this analytical activity will provide several benefits for teachers, such as providing information on the extent to which their students are progressing in achieving their writing learning goals, while for students, this can make it easier for them to improve their writing skills. In this study, researchers conducted a study of students' mistakes in writing descriptive texts. Researchers chose descriptive text because many students did not grasp the method and purpose of writing this text model correctly,

particularly in descriptive text. Based on this background, the authors are interested in examining students' mistakes in writing skills through descriptive text in class VII SMP N 4 Takengon.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing

Writing is a "Natural gift," but it is not an automatic process. Besides, Oshima (1997) utter that writing is a progressive activity. According to Sampson (1985: 27); Nöth (1995: 259), writing is a human mechanism to describe utterances of a verbal language that apply permanent visible signs. In line with that, Harmer (2004) states that writing is an intermediary of communication by writing a message. Indeed, Brown (2001); Boardman (2002); Nunan (2003: 88); Harmer (2004) writing is the creation or process of thinking and productive skill to construct ideas, reflection to convey them into excellent writing and present the ideas into sentences or paragraphs legibly.

Furthermore, it also involves knowledge of grammar, syntactical, mechanical, and organization of ideas (Rizqiya et al., 2017). In writing skills, the student is expected to grasp the hint covers grammar usage, paragraph composition, and sentence structure (Hanbury, 2002: 2). Developing writing activities will train students to express their creative thoughts or ideas, be trained, and think creatively and critically through writing. Further writing allows students to create an imaginary world from their word designs (Kern, 2000). Finally, as literacy skills, writing is critical for learners to obtain and expand academic knowledge in science (Fang et al., 2010). According to Carrasquillo, Kucer, & Abrams, 2004; Fang et al., 2010 stated that without this writing ability, students' understanding will be limited and lack the knowledge to engage in critical thinking.

From the definitions presented above, the writer could conclude that writing is the parlance skill used to communicate with the reader to express things and feelings in written form to make the readers understand, and they can experience the things and feel conveyed in the text. In developing this writing ability, it is necessary to process and write steps, such as drafting and redrafting texts (Nunan 1999). According to Flower & Hayes (1986), step one is brainstorming or pre-writing, next is writing, then is revising, for further is editing, and the last is publishing. While Raimes (1991) identified primary stages of writing as 1) Pre-writing, in this section is the area to choose a topic and plan what will be delivered, 2) writing is placing the outline or draft on the media used, 3) Revising is planning changes and improvements to strengthen the writing, 4) editing and proofreading is put down expressions and punctuation, 5) evaluation, this step aims to assess the results of the writing.

Descriptive Text

Description text is a contents model that includes the characteristics of something. It intends to describe and disclose whether people, animals, places, objects, police reports, warrants, and specific lab reports require descriptions to be effective (Ewald, 1983: 199). The descriptive text aims to give information about something or someone to

make the readers able to imagine and feel it (Nurlaila, 2013). The more comprehensive, descriptive text contains two generic structures; identification and description (Gerot & Wignel, 1994; Alice et al., 1997; Kistono, 2006; Wardiman, 2008). In identification, the writer describes the topic, while the writer clarifies the topic (appearance, quality, or phenomenon) in the description. The lexicogrammatical features that appear in a descriptive text are specific participants, simple present, and adjective describing, numbering, or classifying. First, a specific participant describes something or someone to be discussed as the text's topic. Second, present tense to show the fact or behavior of the participant. Third, adjective to describe the participant. Therefore, the writers are expected to describe the topic realistically.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this study, the researcher used descriptive qualitative research because the researcher describes the kinds of errors in writing through the descriptive text in the VII grade of SMP N 4 Takengon. In other statements, Moleong explains a qualitative approach as a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of written words from what people say or observable behavior (Moleong, 2009). This researcher's data source is the students' VII grade of SMP N 4 Takengon is 24 students. To collect data, the researcher uses observation and tests the students' errors in writing ability through a descriptive. Analysis data is the process of systematically searching and compiling data by organizing into categories and arranging into patterns, choosing what is essential and which will be studied, and making conclusions so easily understood by both researchers and the reader (Sugiyono, 2008). Besides, Miles and Huberman explain three-step to analyze data in descriptive qualitative research: data reduction, display of data, and data verification (Miles and Huberman, 1994).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

In data collection, the researcher introduced descriptive text to students studying in grade VII SMP N 4 Takengon. Then the researcher conducts some descriptive text in English to students like under and over function. Then the researcher asks them to make sentences better from the sheet. This method conduct with the student for more understands of the descriptive text function given by the teacher. Finally, the researcher gave a test to got information about students' abilities through descriptive text. This test makes in 3 sentences by students with time are 30 (thirty) minutes. Test that given to students in the form of the sheet, the text about the book, and chair description. The score of the test consists of three aspects is present tense, adjective, and conjunction. Next step, the researcher analyzed the data in each aspect. The result has been in the form of a total score. The analysis of students errors in writing is distributed in the form of a table as follows:

Table 1. Total score

No	Name	Error Analysis		
		Adjective	Conjunction	Present Tense
1	Fathin UH	1	2	2
2	Rika V	1	2	2
3	Zahara	4	2	-
4	Maulida	1	2	2
5	Salsabilla	2	3	3
6	Al Mizan H	2	3	3
7	Salina	-	2	2
8	Rindi A	2	3	-
9	Salvani R	1	3	1
10	M. T F	1	1	1
11	Rina M	1	3	2
12	Alkandi B	1	2	2
13	Nila W K	2	1	1
14	Anisah B	1	2	2
15	Alfian D	1	1	1
16	Sri M A	3	1	-
17	Auliansar	2	2	2
18	Intan S	2	2	2
19	Sara D	1	2	1
20	Ardjoena S	2	2	2
21	Abdul K	1	1	2
22	Rafika S	1	2	1
23	Wahyuni R	1	3	2
24	Arwanda P	1	1	1
Total Students		23	24	21
Total Wrong Word		35	48	37

The table above shows the students' errors in the adjective section. 23 students experienced errors, 14 students made 1 word for each mistake, 7 students found 2 wrong words, 1 student found 3 wrong words, and 01 student found 4 wrong words. Furthermore, in the conjunction section, 24 students made mistakes, 12 students experienced problems with the number of each 2 wrong words, 6 students each constrained 1 word, and 6 students each constrained 3 words. Finally, in the present tense section, students who experienced problems were 21 students, 11 students made mistakes as much as 2 forms of the present tense, 7 students each 1 form, and 2 students each 3 forms of present tense that were not appropriate.

Discussion

In this chapter, the researcher discusses the findings of the study and analyzes the previous one. In addition to the data being analyzed in general, every aspect is also analyzed as below.

The first aspect of being analyzed is the adjective. Adjectives are words used to describe nouns or pronouns: people, places, animals, objects, or abstract concepts. In use,

several adjective forms can be used in sentences. Among them are: 1) Adjective phrase, this form is the result of a combination of an adjective as a head and a modifier or determiner. 2) Compound adjective, the Adjective form can also combine with other parts of speech such as nouns and verbs to form a new word. Now, when this happens, the resulting new word is called a compound adjective. The findings of this study show that students tend to have problems with the compound adjective form. It is hoped that the teacher will be able to deepen students' understanding of adjective forms and the use of adjectives in English in the future. Based on the total students' errors in writing adjectives, 23 students (95.8 %) and total wrong words are 35 (145.8 %).

$$23 \times = 95.8 \%$$

$$35 \times = 145.8 \%$$

The second aspect was analyzed in conjunction. It is words that join together other words or groups of words (Merriam-webster.com, 2021). The shape can be profound. 1) A coordinating conjunction connects words, phrases, and clauses of equal importance, the central coordinating conjunctions are and, or, and but (Merriam-webster.com, 2021). 2) A correlative conjunction is a conjunction used in pairs to show a relationship between two words, phrases, or clauses. This conjunction is also called pair conjunction, such as between... and..., both... and..., either... or..., etcetera. 3) A subordinating conjunction introduces a subordinate clause (Merriam-webster.com, 2021).

In this case, all students have problems understanding the form and use of conjunctions in sentences to become confused and unbalanced. Based on students' total errors in writing conjunctions, there were 24 (100%) students, and the total number of wrong words was 48 (200%).

$$24 \times = 100$$

$$48 \times = 200$$

The last is from the aspect of the present tense. We can interpret the simple present as the simplest form of the verb of the other tense types. This verb is used to denote a daily, repetitive activity such as a routine or habit. It is one of the most frequently used tenses in English. The simple present tense is divided into the simple verbal present and the nominal simple present. Verbal simple present tense uses a verb that denotes an action or action. Meanwhile, the simple present nominal uses the verb 'be' or so-called to be.

The data shows that students have problems understanding the simple present tense, based on the total error of students in writing the present tense, which is 21 (87.5%) students, and total wrong present tense is 154 (154%).

$$21 \times = 87.5\%$$

$$37 \times = 154\%$$

Overall:

Total Students

$$95.8 + 100 + 87.5 = 283$$

$$283/3 = 94 \%$$

Total Wrong Word

$$145.8 + 200 + 154 = 499.8$$

$$499.8/3 = 166.6 \%$$

The students' error in writing in the information above, especially the total number of students, was 94%, and the total wrong word was 166.6%. It was because students' understanding of writing was still low, both from understanding adjectives, conjunctions, and present tense. Finally, analysis of student writing is a standard teacher task across academia and serves as the basis for making decisions regarding the planning, delivery, and assessment of written products (Pery-Woodley, 1991 in Ahmad, 2019). Therefore, the successes and obstacles in teaching writing are based on several factors. First, pass on the teacher's knowledge and understanding of writing and writing approaches. Second, teaching writing that is successful is how to implement the teaching method. Finally, there is a study explaining that the writing ability of students and teachers whose English as a second language must at least be competent in more than one language, so that if they encounter language code-switching, it can be understood (Badger & White 2000; Chikiwa & Schafer 2016 in Ngubane et al., 2020).

CONCLUSIONS

After researching and analyzing the data, the authors concluded that the types of errors in writing descriptive texts of seventh-grade students of SMP N 4 Takengon came from three aspects: adjectives, conjunctions, and present tense very worrying and dangerous. The results showed the students' total error in writing adjectives, 23 students (95.8%), and the total number of wrong words is 35 (145.8%). The students' total errors in writing the conjunctions were 24 (100%) students, and the total wrong words were 48 (200%). Based on students' total error in writing the present tense, 21 (87.5%) students and the total wrong present tense are 154 (154%) words.

From this conclusion, teachers should motivate students and encourage student learning in class, especially in motivating students in writing. Expect students to develop their English, especially about writing in learning English. Ask the teacher about the lesson if you still do not understand it.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Z. (2019). Teacher Beliefs about Students' Use of Cohesion in Writing: What Does the Textual Evidence Reveal?. *Journal of Language and Education*, 5(4), 9-24.
<https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2019.9708>
- Bacha, N. N. (2002). Developing learners' academic writing skills in higher education: A study for educational reform. *Language education*, 16(3), 163-173.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780208666826>
- Badger, R. & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *English Language Teaching Journal* 54(2), 153-160.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153>
- Behizadeh, N., & Engelhard, G. (2011). Historical view of the influences of measurement and writing theories on the practice of writing assessment in the United States. *Assessing Writing*, 16(3), 189-211.
<https://doi:10.1016/j.asw.2011.03.001>

- Birhan, A.T. (2018). Effects of Mastery Learning Instruction on Engineering Students' Writing Skills Development and Motivation. *Journal of Language and Education*, 4(4), 20-30.
<https://doi.org/10.17323/2411-7390-2018-4-4-20-30>
- Boardman, A. (2002). *Writing to communicate*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (second edition). New York: Longman.
- Calkin, A. B. (2018). Writing on writing. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 87(2018), 127–137.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.05.002>
- Carrasquillo, A., Kucer, S. B., & Abrams, R. (2004). *Beyond the beginnings: literacy interventions for upper elementary English language learners*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Chikiwa, C. & Schafer, M., (2016). Teacher code-switching consistency and precision in a multilingual mathematics classroom. *African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education* 20(3), 244–255.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/18117295.2016.1228823>
- de Oliveira, L. C., & Lan, S. W. (2014). Writing science in an upper elementary classroom: A genre-based approach to teaching English language learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 25(2014), 23–39.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.05.001>
- Devitt, A. J. (2004). *Writing genres*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Elton, L. (2010). Academic writing and tacit knowledge. *Teaching Higher Education*, 15(2), 151–160.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562511003619979>
- Fang, Z., Lamme, L. L., & Pringle, R. M. (2010). *Language and literacy in inquiry-based science classrooms, Grades 3 - 8*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Florence, M. K., & Yore, L. D. (2004). Learning to write like a scientist: Coauthoring as an enculturation task. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 41(6), 637–668.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20015>
- Flower, L.S. & Hayes, J.R., (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication* 32(4), 365–387.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/356600>
- Gerot, Linda, and W. P. (1994). *No Title Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Antipodean Educational Enterprises.
- Hacker, D., & Sommers, N. (2016). *Rules for writers* (8th ed.). USA: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Essex, UK: Pearson Education.
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy, and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148–164.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005>
- Kern, Richard. (2000). *Literacy and Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- King, D. H. (2002), *Writing Skills 2nd Edition, Comprehensive Instruction for Struggling Writers*, United States: Educators Publishing Service.
- Kistono. (2006). *The Bridge English Competence*. Jakarta: Yudhistira.
- Langan, John. (2010). *Exploring Writing Sentences and Paragraphs*. New York: McGraw Hill.

- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2005). Designing literacy pedagogy: Scaffolding asymmetries. In R. Hasan, C. M. I. M. Matthiessen, & J. Webster (Eds.), *Continuing discourse on language* (pp. 251–280). London, England: Equinox.
- Miles and Huberman. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis (2nd edition)*. CA: Sage Publications.
- Moleong, Lexy J. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2011). *Writing: 2011*. US: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/writing_2011/g8_national.aspx?tab_id = tab2&subtab_id = Tab_1#chart
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *Average reading score of eighth-grade students in 2017 higher in comparison to 2015*. US: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_2017/nation/scores?grade = 8.
- Ngubane, N., Ntombela, B., & Govender, S. (2020). Writing approaches and strategies used by teachers in selected South African English First Additional Language classrooms. *Reading & writing*, 11(1), a261.
<https://doi.org/10.4102/rw.v11i1.261>
- Noth, W. (1995). *Handbook of semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. New York: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. Singapore: McGraw Hill.
- Nurlaila, A. P. (2013). The Use Of Mind Mapping Technique In Writing Descriptive Text. *Journal of English Education*, 1(2), 9–15.
<https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/L-E/article/view/578/435>
- Olinghouse, N. G., Graham, S., & Gillespie, A. (2015). The relationship of discourse and topic knowledge to fifth graders' writing performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 107 (2), 391–406.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037549>
- Oshima, Alice and Hogue, Ann. (1997). *Introduction to Academic Writing, Second Edition*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Panadero, E., & Jonsson, A. (2013). The use of scoring rubrics for formative assessment purposes revisited: A review. *Educational Research Review*, 9(2013), 129–144.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2013.01.002>
- Pery-Woodley, M. (1991). Writing in L1 and L2: Analyzing and evaluating learners' texts. *Language Teaching*, 24(2), 68–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800006170>
- Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages Quarterly* 25(3), 407– 430.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3586978>
- Reiff, M. J., & Bawarshi, A. (2011). Tracing discursive resources: How students use prior genre knowledge to negotiate new writing contexts in first-year composition. *Written Communication*, 28(3), 312–337.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088311410183>
- Rivard, L. P., & Straw, S. B. (2000). The effect of talk and writing on learning science: An exploratory study. *Science Education*, 84, 566–593. Rivard, L. P., & Straw, S. B. (2000). The effect of talk and writing on learning science: An exploratory study. *Science Education*, 84(5), 566–593.
[https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-237X\(200009\)84:5 < 566::AID-SCE2>3.0. C.O.;2-U](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-237X(200009)84:5 < 566::AID-SCE2>3.0. C.O.;2-U)

- Rizqiya, R., Pamungkas, M., & Inayah, R. (2017). The Use Of P.O.W.E.R. Learning As A Learning Strategy To Improve Students Writing Competency. *Okara: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 11(2), 253-262.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.19105/ojbs.v11i2.1491>
- Rothschild Ewald, Helen, (1983). *Writing As Process: Invenon And Convenon*, Ohio: A Bell & Howell Company.
- Roscoe, R., Wilson, J., Patchan, M., Chen, D., & Johnson, A. (2020). Modeling Student Evaluations of Writing and Authors as a Function of Writing Errors. *Journal of Language and Education*, 6(2), 147-164.
<https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2020.10316>
- Sampson, G. (1985). *Writing systems: A linguistic introduction*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- S.L. Kim and D. Kim. (2021). English learners' science-literacy practice through explicit writing instruction in invention-based learning. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 2–2(2021), 100029.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100029>
- Sugiyono. (2008). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Wang, J., & Engelhard, G. (2019). Conceptualizing rater judgments and rating processes for rater-mediated assessments. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 56(3), 582–602.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jedm.12226>
- Wardiman, Antono, (2008). *English in focus for Grade VII Junior High School (SMP/MTs)*. Jakarta: DEPIKNAS.
- Warwick, P., Stephenson, P., Webster, J., & Bourne, J. (2003). Developing pupils' written expression of procedural understanding through the use of writing frames in science: Findings from a case study approach. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25(2), 173–192.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690210163251>.

Dictionary

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/>