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Abstract
This research is discussed finding the effect of self-assessment on students' writing competency in the English Elementary Level Course. There was an observation before conducting this research to find out students' writing competency. This research was done in Akademi Komunitas Manajemen Perhotelan Indonesia especially on Elementary Level Course Students. It was located in Kuta Utara District, Badung Regency. In the academic year 2022/2023, this level has 5 classes. This research was done for 6 months which were divided into 3 phases, namely: preparation and proposal, data collection, and finishing. Preparation and proposal were done in 3 months starting from June 2022 until August 2022. Data collection was done in 1.5 months starting from the end of August until the beginning of October 2022. Lastly, finishing was done for 1.5 months after the data were acquired. Based on the finding and discussion, the conclusion can be made as There is no significant effect of self-assessment on students' writing competency separately. It is proven from the Sig value of 0.984 which is higher than 0.05. The English teachers are suggested to apply self-assessment in irregular classes, not online learning. It is because some problems might make self-assessment ineffective. The students are suggested to be open if they have problems understanding and implementing self-assessment. Furthermore, they also have to be serious during online classes to achieve learning goals.
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INTRODUCTION

Many students are good at speaking but they lack writing. Many factors impacted their weaknesses in writing skills. Based on the previous observation which was done by the writers on students in the Elementary Level course program, known one of the major aspects that influenced their writing is, there was no appropriate assessment used in checking their writing task. The teacher focused on speaking skills and did not talk much about writing skills. This phenomenon made the writers eager to conduct this research on them.

About assisting the students in producing whole pieces of communication, linking and developing facts, concepts, or arguments for a specific reader or audience. As a result, the following are necessary for effective writing: a high level of organization when it comes to the growth and structure of arguments, facts, and ideas. Hedge also lists qualities like high levels of correctness, intricate grammar techniques, and careful selection of language and sentence structures to generate style, tone, and content suitable for readers of one’s written text (Hedge, 2005)

As we know, one of the skills to be proficient in English is writing. Competency in writing is important to be owned by the students. According to Celce-Murcia (2001), there are three basic justifications for teaching writing in EFL classes. Writing is a type of written communication, to start. Students can communicate and share their views with others through writing. Second, students can communicate and share their views with others through writing. Second, students can communicate and share their views with others through writing. Second, students can communicate and share their views with others through writing. Second, students can communicate with nearby or far-off, familiar or unfamiliar readers by writing. It differs from oral communication, which only occurs between near interlocutors when speaking and listening. The exchange of thoughts and ideas can take place through writing when individuals create and share their written work with readers. Their writing can be regarded as an expression of their creativity as they freely articulate their ideas and emotions about a specific subject on paper (Safitri, Tari, and Lindawati, 2020).

Finally, not every student has good oral communication skills. They could be tense, insecure, unattractive, etc. Consequently, they may find that writing is a good way to communicate. The cognitive and linguistic domains that makeup writing make it a complicated process. The linguistic domain includes syntax, structure, vocabulary, spelling, and mechanics, whereas the cognitive domain focuses on the quality and organization of thoughts (Marhaeni, in Jiwandani, 2021). Students find writing to be challenging as a result (Fahimia and Rahimib, 2014; Comert and Kutlu, 2017). Dharma and Adiwijaya (2018)
demonstrated the difficulty of writing. The study shows that senior high school students still have poor writing skills. It is evident from the writing proficiency average score, which is still below the stated passing mark. Most often, students struggle to organize their thoughts, use proper grammar, and choose appropriate language. Most often, their sequencing of ideas is not chronological.

Innovative approaches should be taken to assist students in producing high-quality writing because of the intricacy of writing. The use of formative assessment, or self-assessment in writing, offers students two main benefits, according to Black et al. (2003): increased self-efficacy (Black et al., 2003; Mills, Pajares, and Heron, 2007) and improved writing abilities (Dharma and Adiwijaya, 2018; Orsmond, Merry, and Reiling, 2000). The use of written self-assessment encourages students to be self-aware and engaged learners.

According to Harmer (2006), writing is categorized into productive skills. It means that the students should produce writing products, such as various genres, short functional text, or certain reports of investigation. According to Mekheimer (2005), teaching writing should be able to get students thinking. It suggests that writing is a method for organizing particular concepts into letters and producing them. To put it another way, the students must exercise creativity in their final writing products. Additionally, writing is seen as a crucial component of kids' academic achievement because it helps strengthen vocabulary, grammatical structure, and even other language abilities like reading, listening, and speaking (Kellogg, 2008). It implies that writing is about more than simply ideas, as well as language components that act as a vehicle for ideas to be communicated.

According to PERMENDIKBUD number 23 from 2016, encouraging students to evaluate their work while they are studying can help them become more self-aware. It is a form of real evaluation that requires learners to evaluate their work. It puts the student's ability to critically analyze and self-reflect on their writing to the test (Toping, 2003). According to it, Rolheiser and Ross (2000) state that students evaluate the quality of their work using data and clear standards to produce better work in the future. The students' self-assessment task entails self-judging their performance to identify their strengths.

Additionally, according to Homstad and Thorson (1994), the process should be a concern while writing in an EFL context. It is based on the fact that writing requires a lot of time because it is a complex process. Exercises should focus more on the language used in reasoning, comparison, and contrast than they should on specific grammar issues when writing is emphasized (Brookes, Arthur, and Grundy, 1990). The writer must focus more on
how to find ideas and organize them during the process than on grammatical issues. Though they are both significant, ideas should take precedence.

The elements of writing should be considered when rating the pupils’ writing. According to Marhaeni (2005), a good piece of writing consists of five different elements: (1) the content's quality; (2) the organization of ideas; (3) the sentence's grammatical structure; (4) diction and style; and (5) mechanics. Since the quality of a paragraph depends on both the linguistics knowledge that is integrated into writing as well as how well an idea is organized, the researcher will combine both qualities of a good paragraph in this study.

In the context of the national curriculum or Curriculum 2013, writing is taught in two modes, writing short functional text and genre. The short functional text covers writing for announcements, advertisements, memos, and labels. Meanwhile, there are several genres of text which become the focus of writing, namely: narrative, descriptive, recount, spoof, hortatory exposition, hortatory analytical, and report. This research focuses on the writing genre, especially narrative, and recounting.

Since writing is thought to be a continuous process (Myer, 1997), students should be provided enough time to complete their writing assignments. Process writing techniques can be the most effective ones to use while teaching writing in the classroom. According to this method, there are five main phases of writing: pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing, and publication (Hill, 2000). These are all possible descriptions for those phases:

1. Pre-writing

   Pre-writing is a crucial step in the writing process since the student captures all of his thoughts on the subject during this period. It aids the writer in organizing their thoughts. The early steps of pre-writing serve as an inspiration and launch point for the writing work, which is input-focused. Several tasks that might be carried out during this stage include:
   a. mapping
   b. outlining
   c. brainstorming
   d. listing
   e. grouping.

2. Drafting

   First of all, they write throughout this stage paying little attention to organization or accuracy. The pupils write swiftly for five to ten minutes on a particular subject
without considering proper grammar or punctuation. If they cannot think of a word while writing as quickly as they can, they can leave a space or write it in their native language. In other words, without giving the rules of grammar much thought, all the ideas that are discovered and explored throughout the pre-writing activity are developed to produce a paragraph. In this stage, it is important to continue writing. Meaning is the most significant characteristic. The writing’s subject should also be the focus of the teacher (or pupils). Second, the pupils take notes organized and written in the pre-writing exercises. It emphasizes the consistency of concepts and information. The exercises involve looking for, finding, and organizing the concepts in a well-written piece. A topic sentence, sentences that will support it, and a sentence that will wrap up the paragraph are all included in the draft.

3. Revising
The writing process requires revision, which is a crucial step. Students now have the chance to edit their paragraphs. Students will focus on the paragraph’s structure and substance. When students have read their work again, they can add, remove, and fix any mistakes. In revision, the meaning is clarified. It is the process of trying to make the connection between what is on paper and what is in your heart and thoughts. Students are helped to understand the characteristics of effective writing by learning how to edit for particular features.

4. Proofreading and Editing
Students can switch gears and check for proper punctuation, grammar, and spelling after revising their writing. The objectives will alter depending on the pupils’ level of maturity. As the year goes on, changing a form’s content can assist close the gap between instruction and assessment. Before the teacher can anticipate that the children would use the form successfully and independently at this stage, terminology and tactics must be modeled and explained to the pupils.

5. Publishing
It is best if the teacher allows the students to publish their writing when they have finished it. A real audience from the other courses can be invited here by the teacher. The writer will learn about the writing’s strengths and faults through publication, as well as whether or not it is intriguing. Furthermore, when they rewrite their essays later, the students will have new insights and comments.
Chen (2008) contends that giving students a voice in performance evaluations will help them take ownership of their education. The kids might become self-motivated learners thanks to their sense of ownership. According to Zimmerman (2001), self-regulation is defined as students being "metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally active participants of their learning." The metacognitive process enables the students to be reflective. Students can assess the accuracy of their work when it happens.

Self-evaluation can improve students' writing in terms of ideas and content, structure, voice, and mechanics, according to Andrade and Du (2007). Additionally, Ratminingsih, Marhaeni, and Vigayanti (2018) find that students are prepared to complete their writing assignments through the use of a checklist and an analytical scoring rubric that helps them to write better writing throughout treatments of self-assessment. With the aid of a checklist and an analytical grading rubric, participants were able to assess how well their writing expressed their thoughts and was structured.

The use of authentic assessment in education is mandated by Minister of Education Regulation No. 23 of 2016. When an assessment directly evaluates a student's performance on significant intellectual tasks, it is considered authentic (Wiggins, 2008). Students must exhibit knowledge and abilities that accurately depict issues and circumstances that they are likely to face in daily life. The ideal solution to this issue is authentic assessment, which is used to characterize the various types of evaluation that take into account students' knowledge gained from instructional relevant classroom activities as well as their achievements, motivation, and attitudes (O'Malley and Valdes, 1996). There are various types of authentic assessment, including self-assessment, performance evaluation, and portfolio evaluation.

Self-assessment is a genuine assessment in which students participate in the evaluation process, according to Pedersen and Williams (2004). The newly stated notions of assessment draw our attention to formative assessment, sometimes known as classroom assessment, which has a long history in education but is currently being questioned by educators. The students actively evaluate their work while it is being put into practice so they can determine the caliber of their output. To help their pupils make accurate assessments, teachers must be ready.

According to it, Orsmond et al. (2000) claim that self-assessment is the process by which students judge their performance in light of the learning objectives. Students are therefore expected to have a better understanding of the learning objectives. In other words,
students become aware of the requirements for a job well done. The communication between teachers and students is improved via self-evaluation. Additionally, self-assessment exercises in the classroom have students reflect on their learning. Because students are likely to form opinions, provide feedback, and acquire certain important skills throughout the evaluation process, self-assessment can be viewed as a learning tool rather than just an assessment system.

Rolheiser and Ross (2003) state that self-assessment plays a key role in fostering an upward cycle of learning. The implementation of self-assessment is rooted in two basic things, goals, and effort. The goals of learning must be clearly stated before self-assessment is implemented. It aims at keeping the students on track. The high effort is needed when self-assessment is implemented. If the students have less effort, they will fail in implementation. With the effort, the students can evaluate their work (writing). The students who do self-assessment well can have self-confidence because they know and understand their work.

Self-assessment does not promote memorization of material or abilities by students. On the contrary, it encourages pupils to think critically and engage in deep learning. Well-created self-assessment processes aid pupils in fully comprehending the subject matter. Additionally, by self-evaluating, students gain knowledge of what they have learned. In this way, self-evaluation aids in students’ awareness of their learning processes. In other words, self-assessment improves students’ understanding of their efficient learning methods. Briefly put, self-assessment is not only a tool for learning but also has the potential to be a tool for metacognition (Mok et al., 2006).

Black et al, (2003) suggest the following guidelines for the successful implementation of student self-assessment:

1. Students need to be given access to the evaluation criteria so they may have a clear understanding of the objectives of their work and what it means to accomplish it.
2. Collaboration in self-feedback skills and habits should be taught to students because they are intrinsically valuable and because self-assessment can help students improve the objectivity of their talents. Students should be encouraged to bear in mind the aims of their work and to assess their progress to meet these aims as they proceed.

Self-assessment plays a crucial part in writing teaching and is a useful tool for students to track their development as writers (Marhaeni, 2007). Writing is a continuous process with many stages, allowing for the implementation of self-assessment at each level.
Students will develop into proactive seekers who seek out information about their skills and limitations as they write. The students can then set up a plan to enhance the caliber of their writing throughout the process. Additionally, students can work together with their teachers and peers during the writing process because they can solicit feedback and questions from both parties.

There are numerous approaches to implementing writing self-evaluations. However, a checklist for self-evaluation and an analytical scoring rubric is used to implement self-assessment in this experimental investigation. A rubric is a scoring tool that outlines the requirements for a piece of work, or "what counts" (for instance, purpose, organization, details, voice, and mechanics are frequently what count in a piece of writing); it also articulates quality gradations for each requirement, from excellent to poor (Goodrich, 1997), whereas a self-evaluation checklist includes several requirements to produce good writing. The students will use the checklist as guidance as they track their learning.

Self-assessment additionally increases students' self-efficacy. According to Baleghizadeh and Mason (2014), implementing self-assessment can help students develop their sense of self-efficacy. Students' perspectives on learning can shift when self-assessment is used as formative evaluation. Students are urged to consider what they must do to learn through self-assessment. People learn it via the checklist or rubric's criteria. They may each see a visual of how the other works. They become more assured in what they do as a result.

The Covid 19 epidemic, however, is when the issue starts. Due to government-regulated health guidelines, online learning should be used in this situation. All students should study at home as schools are closed. Their friends and teachers were not visible to them immediately. Their only in-person encounters take place online. Since they may communicate in person, this circumstance differs from conventional learning in many ways.

According to Rosenberg and Hartley (2001), online learning is a type of instruction that employs internet technology to send students problems and solutions. It attempts to raise the knowledge and skill levels of the students. Online education makes the best use of newly developed technologies, including the internet, laptops, computers, and smartphones. It implies that education is not limited to the classroom.

Bilfaqih and Qomarudin (2015) identified three features of online learning. First, learning is done online or through specific platforms on websites. The students can learn it anywhere because the teachers can use platforms to meet them or to send them stuff. Second,
because learning is done remotely, students do not need to attend class. Third, everyone can attend the lesson because it is open to anyone. However, there is also online education that only some people may access, such as online education for specific classes.

Alkhalaf, Drew, and Alhussain (2012), Sadikin and Hamidah (2020), Noesgaard and RNgreen (2015), and El-Seoud (2014) all conducted studies in the field of online learning. All studies demonstrate the benefits of online learning for students in terms of motivation, effectiveness, enjoyment, and productivity. Additionally, the studies discovered that because the teachers had provided the learning resources, it was simpler for the students to obtain them. The studies were conducted in higher education.

The majority of the research on self-assessment in writing classes has used regular writing classes with face-to-face classroom contact. The impact of self-evaluation on writing in the context of online learning receives scant study. So, the purpose of this study is to find out whether or not the effect of assessment towards the writing competency on students in Elementary Level Courses.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research was done in Akademi Komunitas Manajemen Perhotelan Indonesia especially on Elementary Level Course Students. It was located in Kuta Utara District, Badung Regency. In the academic year 2022/2023, this level has 5 classes. This research was done for 6 months which were divided into 3 phases, namely: preparation and proposal, data collection, and finishing. Preparation and proposal were done in 3 months starting from June 2022 until August 2022. Data collection was done in 1.5 months starting from the end of August until the beginning of October 2022. Lastly, finishing was done for 1.5 after the data were acquired.

A population is a group of people to which the research results are generalized (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2009). In the education context, it can be students, teachers, or other individuals having the same characteristics. In the context of this research, the population was five groups of Elementary Level in the academic year 2022/2023. There are 100 students in these groups. The distribution of the population can be presented in the table below:

Table 1
The population of the Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>G. 1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meanwhile, the sample is a smaller part of the population (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2009). From the sample, the data will be collected. To choose the sample, cluster random sampling was used. It is because the population is in the group. Here, the lottery technique will be used. The steps were as follows.

1. Two groups were selected by using a lottery. From the lottery, it was selected group 2 and group 5 as samples.
2. After Group 2 and Group 5 were selected, the lottery was used again to determine the control group and treatment group. From the lottery, group 5 became the treatment group and Group 2 became the control group. The control group was treated by using conventional assessment and the treatment group was treated by using self-assessment.

Since this research has the purpose of the effect of self-assessment on students’ writing competency, Nonequivalent Control Group Design was applied. It is selected because the cluster has been established in fix class so it is impossible to make a new group. The design can be presented in the Picture below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Fraenkel and Wallen, 2009)

**Research Design**

Note:

X = self-assessment
C = conventional assessment
O = measurement of the dependent variable (posttest)

Practically in the context of this research, the design is started by selecting two classes in the same grade randomly. At the same time, it is randomly selected which class becomes
the treatment group and control group. The experimental group is treated by using self-assessment; the control group is treated by using conventional assessment. The treatment was done for 8 meetings. In the end, both groups were given the same posttest.

A variable is a concept—a noun that stands for variation within a class of objects, such as a chair, gender, eye color, achievement, motivation, or running speed (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2009). There are two types of variables in this research, dependent and independent variables. An Independent variable is a variable that is being manipulated in an experiment to observe the effect on a dependent variable; meanwhile dependent variable is a variable that is dependent on an independent variable.

In the context of this research, the independent variable was the assessment type consisting of self-assessment and conventional assessment; meanwhile, the dependent variables were the students’ writing competency. To collect the data, two methods were used, 1) giving a test and 2) questionnaire distribution. The test method was used to collect data on students’ writing competency, meanwhile questionnaire method was used to collect students’ self-assessments. Instrumentation covers all instruments that will be used to collect the data. Four instruments were used, namely: 1) a writing competency test, 2) an analytical scoring rubric, 3) a self-assessment checklist, and 4) a teaching scenario. In detail, they can be explained as follows

A. Writing Competency Test

The writing competency test is designed to test the student’s writing competency. It is in the form of a performance test. There is only one item in the test. Here, it is formulated the blueprint of the test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Range of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Content and development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Topic is relevant to the assignment</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Main idea is stated clearly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Main idea is supported by clear evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Having high knowledge of the topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Showing appropriate generic structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Coherence</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grammar and structure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Word order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The effectiveness of sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The accuracy of grammar</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vocabulary and style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The use of correct diction and idioms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The use of the correct form of words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The use of standard language, not slang</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Spelling</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Analytical Scoring Rubric**

An analytical scoring rubric was used to score the students’ writing. The indicators used were the same as in the blueprint of the writing competency test.

**C. Self-assessment Checklist**

The self-assessment checklist was designed to be used as guidance in doing self-assessment. The checklist was modified from Marhaeni (2005). There were 3 checklists designed, namely: content and development, grammatical structure, and mechanic.

**D. Teaching Scenario**

The teaching scenario was designed as guidance in an experiment. There were two teaching scenarios designed, a teaching scenario for the experimental group and a teaching scenario for the control group. Both were the same in terms of material, topic, and number of meetings. They were only different in terms of steps.

**Methods of Data Analysis**

Data analysis was done to test the hypothesis and to answer the research question. Here, the quantitative data analysis method was used because the data were in the form of numbers. There were two statistical analysis methods used, descriptive and inferential analysis methods.

1. **Descriptive Analysis**

The descriptive analysis is aimed at describing data as it is. It included the calculation of central tendency (mean) and dispersion (standard deviation). The calculation of the mean
is aimed at knowing the average score of each group so it can be known which group is better. Meanwhile, the calculation of standard deviation is aimed at knowing the heterogenous level of each group. After that, it was continued the classify the students' score-based criterion norm test with five classifications. Before it is done, the student's scores are first transformed into the 100 range. Then, the score of each student is classified in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 – 100</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 – 89</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 79</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 54</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After that, the student’s scores are presented in the form histogram.

2. Inferential Analysis

Inferential analysis was done to test the hypothesis or to answer the research question. Here, the parametric statistic was used meaning that two parameters should be true, like the distribution of data and its variation. Here, Way Multivariate Analysis (MANOVA) was used for hypothesis testing. It was selected because there were only two groups to be compared and there were two dependent variables. Before the hypothesis was done, three prerequisite tests should be fulfilled, the normality test of data distribution, the homogeneity test of variance, and the variance/covariance matrix (Candiasa, 2010).

a. Normality Test of Data Distribution

A normality test was done to ensure that the data were normal in distribution. So, generalization can be done. Here, the normality test was administered to four groups of data, namely: 1) data of students’ writing competency treated by self-assessment, and 2) data of students’ writing competency treated by conventional assessment. The normality test was done with the Saphiro-Wilk formula with the help of SPSS 17 for Windows. The criteria of the decision were presented if the probability value significance is more than 0.05, it can be stated as normal, and on the other hand, if it is less than 0.05 can be stated as not normal.
b. Homogeneity of Variance Test

Homogeneity of variance test was done to know the homogeneity variants in the group. So, the variants acquired from the MANOVA test come from the variants between groups, not come from the variants within the group. The homogeneity of variants test used Levene’s test with the help of SPSS 17 for Windows. The criteria of the decision were presented as if the data are classified to be homogenous if the probability value (Sig.) is higher than 0.05.

c. Variance/Covariance Matrix

This test will be done to ensure that the variance/covariance matrix of dependent variables is homogeneous. This test will be done with the Box M formula with the help of SPSS 17 for Windows. The criteria of the decision were presented as if the Probability value (Sig.) ≥ 0.05 means the data are Homogenous, but if the Probability value (Sig.) ≤ 0.05 means the data are Heterogenous. (Candiasa, 2010)

d. Hypothesis Testing

As mentioned previously, hypothesis testing was done by the MANOVA test. Before it was done, it was made the statistic hypothesis firstly as follows.

Hypothesis :

\[ H_0 : \mu_{YA1} = \mu_{YA2} \]
\[ H_1 : \mu_{YA1} \neq \mu_{YA2} \]

Note :

\( \mu_{YA1} \) = the mean score of students’ writing competency treated by using self-assessment
\( \mu_{YA2} \) = the mean score of students’ writing competency treated by using conventional assessment

The calculation was done by SPSS 17 for Windows. The criteria for making a decision can be stated as follows :

1. Probability value (Sig.) ≥ 0.05 means H0 is accepted and can be concluded that Simultaneously or separately, there is no significant difference in writing competency between the students treated by using self-assessment and conventional strategy, and
2. A probability value (Sig.) ≤ 0.05 means H0 is rejected and can be concluded that there is a significant difference in writing competency between the students treated by using self-assessment and conventional strategy.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The findings and discussion can be presented as follows.

a. The Effect of Self-Assessment on Students’ Writing Competency

Descriptive Data Analysis

Data description covers the calculation of mean and standard deviation. The calculation of the mean and central tendency used SPSS 17 for Windows and the result can be presented in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1Y1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.1538</td>
<td>6.67947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2Y1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.1154</td>
<td>7.12363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A1Y1 = students’ writing competency treated by using self-assessment

A2Y1 = students’ writing competency treated by using conventional assessment

Based on the Table 4, it can be concluded as follows.

1. The mean score of students’ writing competency treated by using self-assessment (28.15) is higher than the mean score of students’ writing competency treated by using conventional assessment (28.12).

2. The standard deviation of students’ writing competency treated by using self-assessment (6.68) is lower than the standard deviation of students’ writing competency treated by using conventional assessment (7.12). It means that the data of students’
writing competency treated by using conventional assessment is more heterogeneous than students' writing competency treated by using self-assessment.

Next, it continued to describe each group of data. the first is students' writing competency treated by using self-assessment (A1Y1). Ideally, the highest score of writing competency was 44 and the lowest score was 11. Since the national education assessment system must be ranging from 0-100, the student's raw score was transformed into the range by dividing the obtained score and then timed by 100. The classification of students' writing competency treated by using self-assessment can be presented in Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Range of Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>90 – 100</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>80 – 89</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65 – 79</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 – 54</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 5, it was known that there was only 1 student (3.85%) whose writing score was categorized as very high, 3 students (11.54%) whose writing score were categorized as high, 6 students (23.08%) whose writing score were categorized into moderate, 10 students (38.46%) whose writing score were categorized into low, and 6 students (23.08%) whose writing score were categorized into very low. Then, the Table above can be visualized into a histogram presented in Picture 1.
Based on Picture 1, it can be seen the students’ score category and its frequency of data A1Y1.

Next is a group of writing competencies treated by using conventional assessment. The classification of students’ writing competency treated by using self-assessment can be presented in Table 6.

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Range of Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>90 – 100</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>80 – 89</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65 – 79</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 – 54</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 6, it was known that there was only 1 student (3.85%) whose writing score was categorized as very high, 3 students (11.54%) whose writing scores were categorized
as high, 9 students (34.62%) whose writing score were categorized into moderate, 5 students (19.23%) whose writing score were categorized into low, and 8 students (30.77%) whose writing score were categorized into very low. Then, the Table above can be visualized into a histogram presented in Picture 2.

![Histogram of Data Classification of A1Y2 in 100](image)

**Picture 2**

**Histogram of Data Classification of A1Y2 in 100**

Based on Picture 2, it can be seen the students’ writing competency score category and its frequency of data A2Y1.

**Inferential Data Analysis**

**Prerequisite Tests**

After the data have been described, it was continued to prerequisite tests. Because hypothesis testing was done by using one-way MANOVA, three prerequisite tests should be done, namely: normality test, homogeneity test, and variance/covariance matrix (Candiasa, 2010). The calculation was done by using SPSS 17 for Windows. The normality test was done by using Shapiro-Wilk because hypothesis testing was done by MANOVA. The result of the calculation was presented in Table 7.
Table 7
The result of the Normality Test by Shapiro-Wilk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Model</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Competency</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 7, it was known that the probability value (Sig.) for all groups (\(A1Y1 = 0.709\), \(A2Y1 = 0.638\), was higher than 0.05. It means that all groups of data were normal in distribution and the analysis can be continued. After the normality test, it was continued to the homogeneity test. The homogeneity test was done by using Levene’s Test. It was done to data on writing competency. The result of the calculation was presented in Table 8.

Table 8
The result of the Homogeneity Test by Levene’s Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing Competency</td>
<td>Based on Mean</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on Median</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on the Median and with adjusted df</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on trimmed mean</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 8, it can be known that the probability value (Sig.) Based on the Mean for writing competency was 0.679. Since the Sig. values for both groups were higher than 0.05, it can be concluded that the variance from both groups was homogeneous. It means that the analysis can be continued. Lastly is the variance/covariance matrix test. This test was done by using the Box M test. The result of the calculation was presented in Table 9.
Table 9

The result of the Variance/Covariance Matrix by Box M Test

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box's M</td>
<td>3.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df2</td>
<td>450000.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests the null hypothesis that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + A

Based on Table 9, it was known that the probability value (Sig.) was 0.288. It was higher than 0.05. It means that the variance/covariance matrix was homogeneous. By these results, hypothesis testing by using one-way MANOVA can be done.

Based on Table 9, it was known that the probability value (Sig.) was 0.288. It was higher than 0.05. It means that the variance/covariance matrix was homogeneous. By these results, hypothesis testing by using one-way MANOVA can be done.

Based on Table 9, it was known that the probability value (Sig.) was 0.288. It was higher than 0.05. It means that the variance/covariance matrix was homogeneous. By these results, hypothesis testing by using one-way MANOVA can be done.

The result of this hypothesis testing the effect of self-assessment on writing competency was presented in Table 10.
Table 10
The Result of Analysis for Self-Assessment on Writing Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Writing Competency</td>
<td>.019(^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Writing Competency</td>
<td>41160.942</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41160.942</td>
<td>863.261</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Writing Competency</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Writing Competency</td>
<td>2384.038</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47.681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Writing Competency</td>
<td>43545.000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Writing Competency</td>
<td>2384.058</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = -.020)

Based on Table 10, it was known that the Sig value of A writing competency was 0.984 which was higher than 0.05. It means that there is no significant effect of self-assessment on writing competency separately.

CONCLUSION

Based on the finding and discussion, the conclusion can be made as There is no significant effect of self-assessment on students’ writing competency separately. It is proven from the Sig value of 0.984 which is higher than 0.05. The English teachers are suggested to apply self-assessment in regular classes not in online learning. It is because some problems might make self-assessment is not effective. The students are suggested to be open if they have problems understanding and implementing self-assessment. furthermore, they also have to be serious during online classes to achieve learning goals.
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