

# Evaluating the Mastery of the English Teachers' Pedagogical Competence in Teaching and Learning Writing at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone

Irma Mulia Setyarini<sup>1</sup>, Sri Wuli Fitriati<sup>2</sup>, Suwandi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>English Language Education, <sup>2</sup>Master Program of English Language Education, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Irma Mulia Setyarini

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20230731>

## ABSTRACT

This research aimed to explain and evaluate the mastery of the eleventh-grade English teachers' pedagogical competence in teaching and learning writing at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone. This research used a qualitative multiple-case study which was also supported by quantitative data. The main subjects in this study were three English teachers from three SMA Negeri in the East Semarang Zone sub-district who teach in the eleventh grade in the academic year 2022/2023. The data were collected through observation, questionnaires, and interview responses. The finding showed that English teachers at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone had a good mastery of pedagogical competence in understanding theories and principles of teaching writing. Then, they had a very good mastery of pedagogical competence in designing a lesson plan for teaching writing and implementing the teaching writing process. Moreover, they had a good mastery of pedagogical competence in organizing students' writing assessments. In addition, they perceived that the students' writing learning processes were good. Students also achieved the target of the minimum mastery criteria score for writing when the English teachers gave them a writing assessment. It concluded that English teachers' mastery of pedagogical competence in teaching writing at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone were good.

**Keywords:** Pedagogical Competence, Teaching Writing, Learning Writing

## INTRODUCTION

The rules for implementing teaching and learning in schools have changed due to the Covid-19 virus. In 2020, all schools implemented study from home through online learning, then changed again by implementing a combination of online and offline learning (blended learning) in the Regions of Java and Bali since July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021. After applying blended learning, the learning rules teaching in schools changed again by implementing 100% face-to-face learning (PTM) using a shift system, i.e., the morning shift (07.00 – 10.00 WIB) and the afternoon shift (11.00 – 14.00 WIB). Moreover, on May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2022, all schools (SD/SMP/SMA) in Semarang implemented a 100% face-to-face learning (PTM) scheme without any changes in the entry or shifting system. With the implementation of teaching and learning that changes according to conditions, teachers are required to be able to present an effective and active learning process. Of course, there are many obstacles faced, both in terms of supporting infrastructure, the learning process, and curriculum preparation during specific conditions.

In addition, starting from the 2021/2022 academic year, the Head of the Central Java Province Education and Culture Office issued a decision on the determination of zoning areas for equal distribution of education quality. The zoning system is

determined through the Decree of the Office of Education and Culture No. 421/ 05769. The decree explains the zoning of each SMA Negeri in Central Java covering several sub-districts. There are 16 SMA Negeri in Semarang which are divided into several sub-districts namely Mijen, Gunung Pati, Banyumanik, Gajah Mungkur, South Semarang, Candisari, Tembalang, Pedurungan, Genuk, Gayamsari, East Semarang, Central Semarang, North Semarang, West Semarang, Tugu, and Ngaliyan.

Based on preliminary research that has been conducted at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone as one of the sub-district division zones which consist of three SMA Negeri, i.e., SMA Negeri 2 Semarang, SMA Negeri 10 Semarang, and SMA Negeri 11 Semarang, it was found that among other skills, writing is the hardest skill. (Hyland, 2003, p. 3) stated that "Learning to write in a foreign or second language mainly involves linguistic knowledge and the vocabulary choices, syntactic patterns, and cohesive devices that comprise the essential building blocks of texts". In other words, there are a lot of knowledge and skills that English learners need to learn in writing, such as grammar, word choice, vocabulary, types of texts, and general knowledge. English teachers play an important role in creating an atmosphere for learning writing that allows students to learn comfortably through classroom management.

This research focuses on teaching and learning writing because based on the Basic Competence 3.3 and 4.3 of the eleventh-grade English syllabus of senior high school, stated that students should be able to compose and make specific texts in the form of a written formal invitation related to school/workplace by paying attention to social functions, text structure, linguistic elements correctly and in context. (Brown & Lee, 2001) proposed that teaching is guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learner to learn, and setting the conditions for learning. It means that teaching writing is providing knowledge of writing and

helping students to understand how to make a text correctly. To gain good writing achievement for students, English teachers need good competencies to make effective English teaching and learning.

Based on Law Number 14 of 2005 Article 10 paragraph 1, there are four teacher's competencies, namely pedagogical, personal, professional, and social competence. Of all competencies, pedagogical competence becomes the focus of this research because it is related to managing the teaching and learning process that distinguishes teachers from other professions. This competence also determines the level of success in the learning process and students' learning outcomes. According to the explanation of Republic of Indonesia Law No. 14 of 2005 about teachers and lecturers, what is meant by pedagogical competence is the competence in managing students' learning. This research will only focus on four core competencies of pedagogical competence, i.e., (1) understanding teaching learning theories and principles; (2) developing a curriculum related to the subject being taught; (3) organizing educational learning; (4) organizing assessment of process and learning outcomes. (Sumual & Ali, 2017) explained that pedagogical competence is the teacher's competence in managing teaching and learning, the four core competencies of pedagogical competence (mastering teaching-learning theories and principles; developing a curriculum related to the subject being taught; organizing educational learning; and organizing assessment of process and learning outcomes) can represent the whole pedagogical competence due to the three main stages of curriculum implementation, i.e., planning, implementation, and assessment. Based on the background of the study, this research aimed to explain and evaluate the mastery of the eleventh-grade English teachers' pedagogical competence in teaching and learning writing at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone.

## METHODS

### Research Design

This research used a qualitative multiple-case study which was also supported by quantitative data. Qualitative data were used to find the information in the field and the data were described and concluded. In addition, quantitative data were used to support the data and showed the mastery of English teachers' pedagogical competence in teaching and learning writing at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone.

### Participants

The main participants in this study were three English teachers from three SMA Negeri in the East Semarang Zone sub-district who teach in the eleventh grade in the academic year 2022/2023.

### Instrument for Collecting Data

In collecting data, this research used observation (observation checklist), questionnaire, interview (interview guidelines), and documentation. The observation checklist and questionnaire are adapted from *Peraturan Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional, Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Direktorat Jendral Guru dan Tenaga Kependidikan Tahun 2016, Pedoman Pengelolaan Penilaian Kinerja Guru*.

### Procedures of Analyzing Data

First, distributing the questionnaire to the eleventh-grade English teachers. Then, observing the mastery of eleventh-grade English teachers' pedagogical competence in teaching and learning of writing by referring to the instrument (observation checklist). After that, conducting interviews with the eleventh-grade English teachers with interview guidelines. The results of interview data with the eleventh-grade English teachers were synchronized with the result of interviews with several students to be more credible. The results of these interviews were accumulated with the learning tools that had been documented. After that, the collected data were sorted

according to the needs to be presented, and finally, conclusions were drawn.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The findings and discussions are presented in five main parts as follows.

### English teachers' mastery of pedagogical competence in understanding theories and principles of teaching writing

The finding showed that English teachers at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone had a good mastery of pedagogical competence in understanding theories and principles of teaching writing. Here were the result of the Questionnaires and Observations which consists of six indicators.

**Table 1 English teachers' mastery of pedagogical competence in understanding theories and principles of teaching writing at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone**

No.	Indicators	T1		T2		T3	
		Q	O	Q	O	Q	O
1.	Providing opportunities for students to master writing material	4	4	4	3	3	3
2.	Ensuring the level of students' understanding and adjusting subsequent writing learning activities based on that level of understanding.	4	4	3	4	4	2
3.	Explaining the reason for the writing activities carried out, related to the success of learning writing.	3	3	3	2	3	3
4.	Applying various approaches and strategies of learning writing creatively.	4	4	3	3	3	3
5.	Utilizing teaching methods of writing creatively that activate students.	4	4	3	3	3	3
6.	Using various techniques to motivate students' willingness to learn writing.	3	4	3	2	3	3
Σ		22	23	19	17	19	18

Q= Questionnaire, O= Observation, 1= Never/very poor, 2=Sometimes/poor, 3= Often/good, 4=Always/very good

First, concerning indicator 1 (providing opportunities for students to master writing learning material), T1 was categorized as "very good" because T1 tried to encourage students to actively understand the formal invitation material on their own first by instructing students to read and underline

the important information they found in the formal invitation material, then discuss the formal invitation material together. Meanwhile, T2 and T3 were categorized as “good” because T2 and T3 did not try to encourage students to actively understand the formal invitation material on their own first but they directly invited students together to understand formal invitation materials through PPT that had been prepared by T2 and T3. As described by (Panev & Barakoska, 2015), some teachers still had not changed their perception that learning was a process of transferring knowledge to students, which only accumulated knowledge.

The finding of indicator 2 (ensuring the level of students' understanding and adjusting subsequent writing learning activities based on that level of understanding) revealed that T1 and T2 were categorized as “very good” because T1 and T2 asked several questions to confirm how far the students understood the formal invitation material. As stated by (Hakim, 2015) regarding the level of students' understanding, in general, English teachers gave open questions and answers in the form of an oral test in order to know and confirm how far the students understood the material just given. On the other hand, T3 was categorized as “poor” because T3 did not really ensure students' understanding and directly continued to explain the next explanation to chase time and material that had not been delivered.

Furthermore, concerning indicator 3 (explaining the reason for the writing activities carried out, related to the success of learning writing), the findings revealed that T1 and T3 were categorized as “good”. Meanwhile, T2 was categorized as “poor”. In the first observation, T1, T2, and T3 started the lesson by first explaining the learning objectives to be achieved. Then, in the second observation, only T3 started the lesson by first explaining the learning objectives to be achieved. In the third observation, only T1 explained the learning objective but at the end of the lesson. Based

on the findings of data collection in the field, English teachers at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone teacher had explained the learning activity that would be carried out, but they still needed improvement in explaining the reason for the writing activities carried out, especially T2.

Then, the finding of indicator 4 (applying various approaches and strategies of learning writing creatively), revealed that T1 was categorized as “very good”. On the other hand, T2 and T3 were categorized as “good”. (Bhairawa, Faridi, & Hartono, 2021) explained that applying an appropriate approach and strategy was necessary for teaching the English language. English teachers at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone under observation applied a scientific approach in accordance with the 2013 curriculum in teaching formal invitation materials by implementing a cooperative learning strategy and a student-centered instructional model T1 combined a scientific approach with a genre-based approach and did not dominate the teaching and learning process. Meanwhile, T2 and T3 dominated the teaching and learning process more than students as the center of the learning process.

Next, the finding of indicator 5 (utilizing teaching methods of writing creatively that activate students), revealed that T1 was categorized as “very good”. On the other hand, T2 and T3 were categorized as “good”. English teachers at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone when teaching writing formal invitations have used various methods. T1 used the lecture method, the question-answer method, the group discussion method, and the project-based learning method. T2 used the lecture method, group discussion method, question-answer method, and project-based learning method. While T3 used the lecture method, demonstration, group discussion method, and project-based learning method. (Sun, 2020) explained that teaching methods have a positive role in activating the students' learning and improving the students' learning efficiency. Based on the findings of

data collection in the field, although T1, T2, and T3 have used various methods in teaching writing formal invitations, T1 was more able to make students active in learning.

Concerning indicator 6 (using various techniques to motivate students' willingness to learn writing), T1, T2, and T3 used different techniques. (Nurani & Rukmini, 2017) explained that the use of specific techniques in the classroom depends on the language skill being learned and the needs of the student. The findings revealed that T1 was categorized as "very good". T1 used the two stay two stray technique in teaching formal invitation materials in the second and the third observation. T1 was already very good at using the two stay two stray technique to teach writing and keep students motivated, and also made students active in learning writing. Meanwhile, T2 was categorized as "poor". T2 used a problem-solving technique in teaching formal invitation material in the first observation but T2 needed to explore a lot of various techniques, not just group discussions to solve problems, so students didn't get bored. Moreover, T3 was categorized as "good". T3 used the think pair share technique in teaching formal invitation material in the second observation. Based on observation, T3 was already good at using a teaching technique, only slightly improved so students didn't get bored in learning writing. Supporting those findings, (Leo, 2013) in (Aisyah, Yuliasri, & Warsono, 2019) stated that no matter how good a teaching technique is, when that technique is used again and again, it is boring.

### English teachers' mastery of pedagogical competence in designing a lesson plan of teaching writing

The finding showed that English teachers at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone had a very good mastery of pedagogical competence in designing a lesson plan of teaching writing. Here were the result of the Questionnaires and Observations which consists of four indicators.

**Table 2 English teachers' mastery of pedagogical competence in designing a lesson plan of teaching writing at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone**

No.	Indicators	T1		T2		T3	
		Q	O	Q	O	Q	O
1.	Designing a writing lesson plan that is in accordance with the syllabus so that students can achieve the specified basic competence.	4	4	4	4	4	4
2.	Determining the activities of teaching and learning writing	4	4	4	4	4	3
3.	Following the sequence of writing learning material by paying attention to the writing learning objectives.	4	4	4	4	4	4
4.	Choosing teaching writing material	4	3	4	4	4	3
Σ		16	15	16	16	16	14

Q= Questionnaire, O= Observation, 1=Never/very poor, 2=Sometimes/poor, 3=Often/good, 4=Always/very good

The finding of the research concerning indicator 1 (designing a writing lesson plan that is in accordance with the syllabus so that students can achieve the specified basic competence), revealed that T1, T2, and T3 were categorized as "very good". It was proved by directly seeing and analyzing the existence of lesson plans and syllabus documents that had been archived by each English teacher. T1, T2, and T3 also stated that they designed a lesson plan based on the syllabus because the syllabus was a guide for teachers in preparing lesson plans. Supporting the finding, (Kumalasari, Setiawan, & Sumarlam, 2017) stated that a lesson plan is developed from the syllabus and guides the student's classroom activities to achieve the basic competencies (KD). Regarding indicator 2 (determining the activities of teaching and learning writing), revealed that T1 and T2 were categorized as "very good", while T3 was categorized as "good". Based on the interview result, T1 determined the teaching and learning activities according to the learning method that she chose and adapted to the time allocation, learning objectives, and student needs. Then, T2 said that she determined the teaching and learning activities by adapting the learning objectives to be achieved, as well as adapting to the learning method. Moreover, T3 explained that her teaching and learning activities made by her were

structured in order to achieve learning objectives. However, based on the analysis of the lesson plan documents of each English teacher in the learning activities section, T3 didn't write the specific learning activities from meeting 1 to meeting 3. T1 and T2 wrote the learning activities more specifically, starting from meeting 1 to meeting 3.

Next, the finding of indicator 3 (following the sequence of writing learning material by paying attention to the writing learning objectives), revealed that T1, T2, and T3 were categorized as "very good". Based on the interview result, T1, T2, and T3 explained that they followed the sequence of formal invitation materials which started from the social function, structure, and language features of a formal invitation. It was also adapted to the learning objectives that had been prepared by them. As stated by (Lucenario, Yangco, Punzalan, & Espinosa, 2016), the learning objective was the target of achieving competency aspects by students in participating in learning activities.

Concerning indicator 4 (choosing teaching writing material), T1 and T3 were categorized as "good", while T2 was categorized as "very good". The finding showed that T1 instructed students to have group discussions as if they were a team within a company that wants to create an event and make a formal invitation for that event, like the grand opening of a new company, a company anniversary event, etc. Then, T2 instructed students to make a formal invitation regarding birthday party invitations, because T2 thought that at the age of eleventh-grade high school students, they had received an invitation to a birthday party (sweet seventeen) from their friends. While T3 instructed students to make a formal invitation regarding the wedding invitation because T3 thought that the student's parents had received a wedding invitation. So, students can learn the formal invitation from that. From those findings, T1 and T3 still needed improvement in choosing formal invitation material related

to the age level of students' learning abilities.

### **English teachers' mastery of pedagogical competence in implementing teaching writing process**

The finding showed that English teachers at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone had a very good mastery of pedagogical competence in implementing the teaching writing process. Here were the result of the Questionnaires and Observations which consists of eleven indicators.

**Table 3 English teachers' mastery of pedagogical competence in implementing the teaching writing process at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone**

No.	Indicators	T1		T2		T3	
		Q	O	Q	O	Q	O
1.	Carrying out writing learning activities in accordance with a complete plan that has been prepared.	4	3	4	3	4	3
2.	Carrying out writing learning activities that aim to help the students' writing learning process.	4	4	4	4	4	4
3.	Communicating new information (e.g., additional material) according to the age and level of writing learning abilities of students.	4	4	4	4	4	4
4.	Responding to writing mistakes made by students as a stage of the learning process, not merely writing mistakes that must be corrected.	4	4	4	4	4	4
5.	Creating a good writing learning environment that ensures safety standards.	4	4	4	4	4	4
6.	Carrying out writing learning activities according to the content of the curriculum and relating it to the context of students' daily lives.	4	4	4	4	4	4
7.	Doing various writing learning activities with sufficient time.	4	4	4	3	4	3
8.	Managing the class effectively without dominating so that students' time can be used productively.	4	4	4	3	4	3
9.	Providing opportunities for students to ask questions, practice, and interact with students.	4	4	4	4	4	4
10.	Organizing the implementation of writing learning activities systematically to help the students' writing learning process.	4	4	4	4	4	4
11.	Using teaching aids, and/or audio-visual (including ICT) to increase students' writing learning motivation in achieving writing learning goals.	4	4	3	3	3	3
Σ		44	43	43	40	43	40

Q= Questionnaire, O= Observation, 1=Never/very poor, 2=Sometimes/poor, 3=Often/good, 4=Always/very good

First, concerning indicator 1 (carrying out writing learning activities in accordance with a complete plan that has been prepared), T1, T2, and T3 were categorized as “good”. Based on observations, there were several things in the opening activities, core activities, and closing activities that in the lesson plan had been designed and determined by T1, T2, and T3 but were not carried out in class. This is because they forgot and were in a hurry to catch up on time to deliver the teaching material.

Then, the finding of indicator 2 (carrying out writing learning activities that aim to help the students' writing learning process), revealed that T1, T2, and T3 were categorized as “very good”. From the interview result, T1, T2, and T3 explained that they often used cooperative learning strategies and applied some teaching techniques in writing learning activities to help the learning process of students. It was proved by observation in class. T1, T2, and T3 showed that they helped students in the learning process of writing formal invitations by applying cooperative learning strategies but using different techniques. T1 applied the two stay two stray technique, T2 applied the problem-solving technique, and T3 applied the think pair share technique.

Furthermore, concerning indicator 3 (communicating new information (e.g., additional material) according to the age and level of writing learning abilities of students), the findings revealed that T1, T2, and T3 were categorized as “very good”. The observation results showed that T1, T2, and T3 provided new information about the formal invitation material being studied in a language that was easily understood by students. T1, T2, and T3 were also always related to the formal invitation material with various information from the surrounding environment to gain students' understanding based on their experiences.

Next, concerning indicator 4 (responding to writing mistakes made by students as a stage of the learning process), the finding reported that T1, T2, and T3 were categorized as “very good”. English

teachers had their own way of responding to students' writing mistakes. The observation in the class indicated when there were students who made mistakes in writing formal invitations, T1, T2, and T3 responded patiently. They responded to students' writing mistakes as a stage of the learning process, so students would minimize writing mistakes and try to write better in the future.

Moreover, the finding of the research concerning indicator 5, the three English teachers at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone showed very good competence in creating a good writing learning environment that ensures safety standards. The observation evidence showed that the classes taught by T1, T2, and T3 were all safe and out of harm's way.

Concerning indicator 6, the three English teachers at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone had very good competence in carrying out writing learning activities according to the content of the curriculum and relating it to the context of students' daily lives. The observation result showed that T1, T2, and T3 have carried out learning activities according to the contents of the curriculum and have related to the context of everyday life. This learning process was a learning process based on the experience that students have experienced in relation to the topic being discussed, namely the formal invitation material.

Regarding indicator 7 (doing various writing learning activities with sufficient time), revealed that T1 was categorized as “very good”, while T2 and T3 were categorized as “good”. The three English teachers at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone carried out a variety of learning which were shown using the strategy, method, technique, media, and learning resources that had been designed in the lesson plan. T1, T2, and T3 entered the class and started the lesson on time. T1 was better than T2 and T3 in managing the teaching-learning time. T1 was very good at managing the teaching-learning time by adjusting the class activities that T1 carried out. Whereas, T2

and T3 in-class observations did not manage the teaching-learning time properly so the class activities that should have been completed that day had to be postponed for the next meeting due to lack of time.

The finding of indicator 8 (managing the class effectively without dominating so that students' time can be used productively), revealed that T1 was categorized as "very good" because T1 involved students in the writing-learning process and only gave lecture formal invitation material at the beginning of the lesson. On the other hand, T2 and T3 were categorized as "good" because T2 and T3 dominated the teaching and learning process more than students as the center of the learning process.

Next, the finding of indicator 9 (providing opportunities for students to ask questions, practice, and interact with students) revealed that T1, T2, and T3 were categorized as "very good". This was shown in the learning process in the classroom, where after T1, T2, and T3 delivered the formal invitation material, they carried out a question-and-answer session so that students were encouraged to convey and ask questions about things they did not understand about the formal invitation material. Then T1, T2, and T3 provided activities for students to practice and interact with their friends by forming a group.

Then, the finding of the research concerning indicator 10, the three English teachers at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone showed very good competence in organizing the implementation of writing learning activities systematically to help the students' writing learning process. This was proven by observation in class. T1, T2, and T3 explained formal invitation material systematically and followed the sequence of learning activities in the lesson plan, from opening activities, core activities, and closing activities. to provide clear and precise learning in order to help the learning process of students.

Concerning indicator 11 (using teaching aids, and/or audio-visual (including ICT) to increase students' writing learning

motivation in achieving writing learning goals) revealed that T1 was categorized as "very good", while T2 and T3 were categorized as "good". Based on the finding of this research, T1, T2, and T3 used the LCD projector and the projector screen facilities from the school properly connected to their laptops. T1 always used them in every meeting, while T2 and T3 used them only at the first meeting. In addition, T1 instructed the students to use their smartphones to access the internet and participate in Quizizz, Padlet, and Interactive Liveworksheet. Meanwhile, T2 and T3 allowed students to use their smartphones to consult an online dictionary and sometimes access Google Translate to help them do assignments.

### **English teachers' mastery of pedagogical competence in organizing students' writing assessment**

The finding showed that English teachers at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone had a good mastery of pedagogical competence in organizing students' writing assessments. Here were the result of the Questionnaires and Observations which consists of five indicators

**Table 4 English teachers' mastery of pedagogical competence in organizing students' writing assessments at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone**

No.	Indicators	T1		T2		T3	
		Q	O	Q	O	Q	O
1.	Constructing writing assessment tools according to writing learning objectives to achieve competencies according to the lesson plan.	4	4	4	4	4	4
2.	Carrying out writing assessments with a variety of assessment techniques and types.	4	4	3	3	3	3
3.	Preparing a writing assessment rubric to assess students' learning writing outcomes.	4	4	4	3	4	3
4.	Analyzing the result of the writing assessment to identify the difficult topics/ basic competencies for remedial and enrichment purposes.	4	3	4	3	4	3
5.	Using the results of the writing assessment as material for the preparation of further writing learning designs.	4	4	4	4	4	4
Σ		20	19	19	17	19	17

Q= Questionnaire, O= Observation, 1=Never/very poor, 2=Sometimes/poor, 3=Often/good, 4=Always/very good



The finding of indicator 1 (constructing writing assessment tools according to writing learning objectives to achieve competencies according to the lesson plan), revealed that T1, T2, and T3 were categorized as “very good”. Assessment tools constructed by T1, T2, and T3 have been adapted to the learning objectives that have been determined in the lesson plan. The main learning objective in formal invitation material is that students can compile/create texts in the form of formal invitations by paying attention to social functions, text structure, and linguistic elements correctly and according to context. The assessment tool used by T1, T2, and T3 to assess students' writing regarding the formal invitation material was the written test.

Then, concerning indicator 2 was about English teachers' pedagogical competence in carrying out writing assessments with a variety of assessment techniques and types. The finding revealed that T1 was categorized as “very good” because T1 had carried out the formative assessment while learning taking place by conducting a non-test through informal spontaneous question-and-answer sessions (oral), quizzing, and padlet to measure students learning progress and to identify parts of the material that need improvement. In addition, T1 gave writing group work where the students directly practice making and writing formal invitation cards, then T1 gave meaningful feedback as the students' revisions. T1 also carried out the summative assessment after the learning had been completed by giving an individual written test (writing formal invitations through live worksheets). Meanwhile, T2 and T3 were categorized as “good”. T2 carried out an oral question and answer and also carried out writing group work as a formative assessment. Then, T2 carried out an individual written test about the project of making a formal invitation as a summative assessment. On the other hand, T3 carried out writing practice of formal invitations to students and give feedback as a formative assessment, and carried out a

summative assessment after the learning had been completed by instructing the students to have a written test to write and make formal invitation cards according to the situation given by T3.

Furthermore, indicator 3 was about English teachers' pedagogical competence in preparing a writing assessment rubric to assess students' learning writing outcomes. The finding of indicator 3 revealed that T1 used an analytic scoring rubric that offered five major categories/aspects (organization, content, grammar, mechanic, and style/quality of expression) and five different levels/scores in each category/aspect ranging from low (1) to high (5). Then, T2 used an analytic scoring rubric that offered five major categories/aspects (content, organization, coherence, vocabulary, and punctuation) and four different levels/scores in each category/aspect ranging from low (0) to high (3). Meanwhile, T3 used an analytic scoring rubric that offered five major categories/aspects (content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics) and three different levels/scores in each category/aspect ranging from low (1) to high (3). From the finding of indicator 3, T1 had more specific level/score criteria in assessing students' writing than T2 and T3.

Concerning indicator 4 was about English teachers' competence in analyzing the result of the writing assessment to identify the difficult topics/ basic competencies for remedial and enrichment purposes. The finding showed that T1, T2, and T3 were categorized as “good”. They only focused on remedial for students who had not been able to reach the set Minimum Criteria of Mastery Learning, so enrichment was less frequently used than remedial. Moreover, T1, T2, and T3 sometimes held remedial outside-of-class hours so that the remedial did not reduce teaching and learning hours that had been allocated in the lesson plan. It was in line with the research conducted by (Emiliasari, 2018). She explained that students who got a low score and had not reached the set Minimum Criteria of

Mastery Learning were given a task after school as their remedial to improve their score.

Moreover, the finding of indicator 5 (using the results of the writing assessment as material for the preparation of further writing learning designs), T1, T2, and T3 were categorized as "very good". This was seen from T1, T2, and T3 who made small notes in the lesson plan regarding the core activities that were felt to be less than optimal in implementation. From the interview result, they explained that they used the results of student writing assessments as data about students' progress in learning writing and as a consideration in determining further learning design. It was also in line with the research conducted by (Emiliasari, 2018). In her research, she explained that the teacher used and utilized the results of the assessment as a benchmark for their success in teaching, it was also used as a basis for preparing further learning designs so that there was an increase in the learning quality.

### **English teachers' perception on students' writing learning process.**

According to (Richards & Renandya, 2002), the writing process consisted of four core stages, i.e., planning, drafting, revising, and editing. So, there are four points to be discussed in this section. First, regarding the students' planning stage of writing. (Richards & Renandya, 2002) explained that the planning stage is the first stage of the learning writing process before students write a text. English teachers at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone perceived that the students were good at planning their writing of formal invitations. The interview results showed that T1 perceived that her students learned to plan their writing together in groups by brainstorming to think and determine the formal occasion, who was invited, what the event was, and what the outline would be like. T2 perceived that her students in groups gathered ideas in the planning stage by discussing and determining what formal occasion it was

addressed to, and then the content of the formal invitation. Same with T1's and T2's perception. T3 thought that in the planning stage, her students explored as much information as possible to support the topic of the formal invitation that would be made. However, T3 told that there were only a few students who said they were confused about determining ideas.

Second, regarding the students' drafting stage of writing. At the drafting stage, the students focus on writing fluency and do not pay too much attention to grammatical accuracy or draft neatness (Richards & Renandya, 2002). So, in this stage, the students put their planning ideas into sentences and paragraphs. Based on the interview results, English teachers at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone perceived that the students were good at making a formal invitation draft. T1 explained that her students had tried their best in drafting a formal invitation. Her students worked together and discussed drafting a formal invitation according to the plan that had been agreed upon in each group on a piece of paper. Moreover, T2 perceived that some students were quite confident in writing formal invitation drafts because they directly wrote a draft using a pen, but some students wrote a draft still using a pencil. On the other hand, T3 perceived that in writing the formal invitation drafts, her students tried to write on a piece of paper or notebook and tried to follow the outline of the formal invitation as closely as possible.

The third point in this section was concerning the students' revising stage of writing. Based on the interview results, English teachers at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone perceived that the students were good at revising stage. T1, T2, and T3 reviewed and gave feedback on the overall students' written drafts. It was supported by the explanation from (Richards & Renandya, 2002). Revising was more than just checking for grammatical errors, the overall content and the way that concepts were organized would be revised. T1, T2, and T3 stated that the most common writing

mistakes in student's writing, especially writing the formal invitation, i.e., related to grammar like the use of future tense in writing the formal invitation text; then related to mechanics like the use of punctuation marks and uppercase. T1, T2, and T3 also stated that the students' content and formal structure of the formal invitation were good and appropriate.

The next point in this section was concerning the students' editing stage of writing. Based on the interview results, English teachers at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone perceived that the students were good at the editing stage. In this stage, students arranged the final result for evaluation. It was supported by the explanation from (Richards & Renandya, 2002). Editing is a process of rechecking the writing result. T1, T2, and T3 perceived that their students' writing results got better after their students edited and rechecked their writing. T1, T2, and T3 also stated that their students' understanding and ability to write formal invitations had improved.

In summary, English teachers at SMA Negeri East Semarang Zone perceived that students' writing learning processes were good which consisted of planning, drafting, revising, and editing. Students also achieved the target of the minimum mastery criteria score for writing when the English teachers gave them a writing assessment. It was in line with the research conducted by (Wahyuni & Rozi, 2020). They explained that the good pedagogical competence of teachers or lecturers was a primary factor in the quality of students' performance. So, this finding concluded that English teachers' pedagogical competencies in teaching writing were good because the students' writing results were good and achieved the target of the minimum mastery criteria score for writing.

## CONCLUSION

From the finding and discussion above showed that English teachers at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone had a good mastery of pedagogical competence in

understanding theories and principles of teaching writing. Then, they had a very good mastery of pedagogical competence in designing a lesson plan for teaching writing and implementing the teaching writing process. Moreover, they had a good mastery of pedagogical competence in organizing students' writing assessments. In addition, English teachers at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone perceived that their students' writing learning processes were good. The students also achieved the target of the minimum mastery criteria score for writing when the English teachers gave them a writing assessment. It concluded that English teachers' mastery of pedagogical competence in teaching writing at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone were good.

## Declaration by Authors

**Acknowledgement:** None

**Source of Funding:** None

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## REFERENCES

1. Aisyah, I. S., Yuliasri, I., & Warsono, W. (2019). The professional and pedagogic competences of English teachers with different UKG (teaching competence test) achievement levels. *English Education Journal*, 9(1), 74–78. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v9i1.27643>
2. Bhairawa, A. A., Faridi, A., & Hartono, R. (2021). The effectiveness of brainstorming and brainwriting strategies to teach writing for students with high and low interest. *International Journal of High Education Scientists (IJHES)*, 2(1), 47–58. <https://ijhes.com/index.php/edu/article/view/133>
3. Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2001). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Regents/Prentice Hall.
4. Emiliasari, R. N. (2018). An analysis of teachers' pedagogical competence in lesson study of MGPM SMP Majalengka. *Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 6(1), 22–33. <https://doi.org/10.22460/eltin.v6i1.p22-33>
5. Hakim, A. (2015). Contribution of competence teacher (pedagogical,

- personality, professional competence, and social) on the performance of learning. *The International Journal of Engineering And Science (IJES)*, 4(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.6084/M9.FIGSHARE.1330039.V1>
6. Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
  7. Kumalasari, S. P., Setiawan, B., & Sumarlam, S. (2017). Pedagogical competence of Indonesia teacher viewed from the anecdote writing lesson planning. *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 11(2), 146–156. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v11i2.8054>
  8. Lucenario, J. L. S., Yangco, R. T., Punzalan, A. E., & Espinosa, A. A. (2016). Pedagogical content knowledge-guided lesson study: Effects on teacher competence and students' achievement in chemistry. *Education Research International*, 2016, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/6068930>
  9. Nurani, A. D. K. S., & Rukmini, D. (2017). Gallery walk and think-pair-share techniques for teaching writing descriptive text to students with high and low motivation. *English Education Journal*, 7(3), 206–212. <https://doi.org/10.15294/EEJ.V7I3.20737>
  10. Panev, V., & Barakoska, A. (2015). The need of strengthening the pedagogical competences in teaching from the English teachers' perspective. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education*, 3(1), 43–50. <https://doi.org/10.23947/2334-8496-2015-3-1-43-50>
  11. Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge University Press.
  12. Sumual, M. Z. I., & Ali, M. (2017). Evaluation of primary school teachers' competence in implementing 2013 curriculum: A study in Tomoho city. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 11(3), 343–350. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v11i3.6429>
  13. Sun, H. (2020). The learning method of peer review in college english writing course. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 15(5), 156–170. <https://doi.org/10.3991/IJET.V15I05.13775>
  14. Wahyuni, R. N. B., & Rozi, F. (2020). The performances of ESP lecturer's pedagogical and professional competences in teaching speaking class (the case study of Semarang University). *English Education Journal*, 10(3), 340–350. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v10i1.36779>
- How to cite this article: Irma Mulia Setyarini, Sri Wuli Fitriati, Suwandi. Evaluating the mastery of the English Teachers' pedagogical competence in teaching and learning writing at SMA Negeri of East Semarang Zone. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2023; 10(7): 241-252.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20230731>

\*\*\*\*\*