



The Implementation of Authentic Assessment to Assess Students' Higher Order Thinking Skills in Writing at MAN 2 Tulungagung

Setyani Rohmatul Muthohharoh✉, Dwi Anggani Linggar Bharati, Fahrur Rozi

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:
Received 20
September 2019
Accepted 30 January
2020
Published 15
September 2020

Keywords:
Authentic Assessment,
Higher Order Thinking
Skills, Writing.

Abstract

PISA (Program for International Students' Assessment) which focuses on three basics literacy stated that Indonesian students are in low position. It is caused by the low ability of Indonesian teachers in writing questions of Higher Order Thinking Skills; henceforth, HOTS. Therefore, the 2013 Curriculum demands teachers to use authentic assessment concerning Higher Order Thinking Skills. This study aimed to investigate the implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' Higher Order Thinking Skills in writing at MAN 2 Tulungagung. This study was qualitative research by using a case study research design. The subjects of this study were two English teachers. The data collection methods were an interview guide, observation checklist, and document observation checklist. The data were then collected and analyzed based on Miles and Huberman (1994). The findings of the study revealed that in implementing authentic assessment to assess students' Higher Order Thinking Skills, these two English teachers did not share scoring rubrics and implement self-assessment for the students because of time limitation. To overcome the difficulties in implementing the authentic assessment, they manage time effectively and efficiently. Furthermore, in order to check students' understanding, the teachers like to walk around the class. This study gives insight about the implementation of authentic assessment which focuses on Higher Order Thinking Skills in writing.

✉Correspondence Address:
Kampus Pascasarjana UNNES Kelud utara 3 Sampangan Semarang,
Indonesia
E-mail: setyanirm@yahoo.com

p-ISSN 2087-0108
e-ISSN 2502-4566

INTRODUCTION

Education is very crucial for a nation. The function of education is to develop students' ability and build good characters to face the world. Regarding the function of education, the Indonesian Ministry of Education has designed structures and basic framework of curricula. Additionally, the Indonesian law Number 20 of 2003 stated that curriculum is a set of planning and setting about aim, content, learning material, and guidance to carry out the learning activity to achieve a certain aim.

In 2013, the Indonesian Ministry of Education has changed the previous curriculum into the 2013 Curriculum. It provides a semester credit system learning program. The Indonesian law Number 20 of 2003 stated that a semester credit system provides education services to students based on talents, interests, and abilities. The students then should complete their education according to their learning pace and should not deviate from the stipulated deadline.

The new curriculum brings out pros and cons from educational practitioners especially teachers and students who directly implement the new curriculum in the classroom. One of the problems that are faced by them is the changing of the assessment system.

Assessment system involves large objectives of education. Assessment is the current process that involves a large field (Brown, 2004, p.4). Authentic assessment encourages not only formative and summative but also other assessments to support the learning process. It is done by teachers to assess readiness, process, and learning outcomes. O'Malley & Pierce (1996, p.4) defines Authentic assessment showing students' learning, attainment, motivation, and behavior on classroom activities

However, teachers still have many challenges in implementing the authentic assessment. According to Aliningsih and Sofwan (2015); Rukmini and Saputri (2017), in reality, teachers are not familiar with authentic assessment. Therefore, implementation of the authentic assessment does not run effectively.

Moreover, teachers usually use multiple choices to assess their students (Natalia, Marhaeni, & Dantes, 2013). Then, according to Marhaeni and Dantes (2014), teachers rarely practice designing authentic assessment and most assessments focus on plans.

Nowadays, the 2013 Curriculum demands teachers to use authentic assessment concerning about students' Higher Order Thinking Skills. Mohamed and Lebar (2017) asserted that authentic assessment has the potential to measure Higher Order Thinking Skills among students. Widana, Parwata, Parmithi, Jayantika, Sukendra, and Sumandya (2018) stated that HOTS assessment measures the metacognitive dimension illustrating the ability to interpret, solve the problem, choose problem-solving strategies, discover new method reasoning, and decision making. The one advantage of HOTS assessment is to increase students' learning motivation (Widana, 2017). Besides, according to PISA (Program for International Students' Assessment) which focuses on three basics of literacy; reading literacy, mathematical literacy, and scientific literacy stated that Indonesian students are in a low position. It is caused by the low ability of Indonesian teachers in writing questions of HOTS (Widana, 2017). Higher Order Thinking Skills is applied in four aspects of language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Writing skill is one skill which has a quite high level of difficulty because writing skill uses the level of intelligence to express ideas into a readable text.

Dealing with the topic above, some studies have been conducted by some researchers. Studies focusing on HOTS assessment has been conducted by Budiman and Jailani (2014); Rubin and Rajakuna (2015); Malik, Ertikanto and Suyatna (2015); Schulz and Patrick (2016); Abosalem (2016); Kusuma, Rosidin, Abdurrahman and Suyatna (2017); Mohammed and Lebar (2017); Tanujaya, Mumu and Margono (2017); Widana, (2017); Toyoda, (2018). Budiman and Jailani (2014); Kusuma, Rosidin, Abdurrahman and Suyatna (2017) conducted a study which only focused on

developing assessment to students' Higher Order Thinking Skills. Meanwhile, studies conducted by Rubin and Rajakuna (2015); Schulz and Patrick (2016); Abosalem (2016); Mohammed and Lebar (2017); Widana, (2017); Toyoda, (2018) and Zebua et al (2017) focused on assessing Higher Order Thinking Skills. Tanujaya, Mumu and Margono (2017) focused on the relationship between HOTS and students' academic achievement. From the previous studies above, the researcher intends to analyze the implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' Higher Order Thinking Skills in writing.

METHODS

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Implementation of Authentic Assessment to Assess Students' Analyzing Skills

The first research question elaborated the implementation of authentic assessment to assess

This study was qualitative research by using a case study research design. The subject of the study was two English teachers. They were Teacher IO and Teacher SS (pseudonym). The object of the study was an authentic assessment to assess students' Higher Order Thinking Skills. The research was conducted in MAN 2 Tulungagung in the academic year of 2018/2019. The units of analysis were lesson plans, materials, test items, and rubrics. The data were collected by an interview guide, observation checklist, and document observation checklist. The data then collected and analyzed through three big steps proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994, p.10).

students' analyzing skill. In this section, students were given the task "find out what is missing" in Teacher IO's class and "find the fact from the conditional sentence Type 1" in Teacher SS's class. The implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' analyzing skill is presented in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1. Assessing student' analyzing skill by Teacher IO

No	The implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' analyzing skill	Teacher IO	
		Find out what missing	
		Yes	No
1	Teacher gives the prompts of the writing concerning on analyzing the problem.	√	
2	Teacher selects the rubrics of analyzing the problem.	√	
3	Teacher shares the rubrics with students about how to score the students' activities including analyzing the problem.		√
4	Teacher identifies the benchmark papers	√	
5	Teacher reviews how students write	√	
6	Teacher provides time and instructional support for self-assessment and peer assessment	√	
7	Teacher introduces self-assessment gradually to students		√
8	Teacher discusses the writing and gives feedback how to analyze the problem.	√	

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that Teacher IO explained illustration to students about the task that would be done by them. Then, he asked them to do the task of finding the missing sentence in a formal invitation. In this task, he did not share the students the criteria consisted in the scoring rubrics because there was

no sufficient time to give rubric for many classes. This finding was in line with Obeid's (2017) findings that teachers had no sufficient time to discuss the scoring rubrics especially if they had big class sizes. Sharing the rubric in the big class would spend more time. Moreover, the rubric was given in each task. As a result, it spent the

other learning activities. However, he had scoring rubric to guide him in assessing students' writing. The criteria were about content, vocabulary, and grammar. Related to the scoring rubrics, Teacher IO used analytical scoring rubric because the rubric was based on the agreement of English teachers in that school through a lesson plan's workshop at the beginning semester. Meanwhile, Han and Huang (2017) finding showed that analytic scoring rubric method could be more appropriate for scoring ESL's writing than holistic scoring. The analytic scoring rubric used detail features of criteria along with grading to assess students' writing. It helped the teachers to provide feedback based on components in rubric directly. Next, Teacher IO identified the examples of formal invitation through PowerPoint. He also provided examples from the books. It was done in order to give more understanding of the topic.

In doing their writing, Teacher IO reviewed how students wrote by focusing on their outline and their thinking about the formal invitation. He corrected their writing about structural grammar and content. These terms became the focus in students' writing to construct good writing. Besides, these terms existed in the scoring rubric.

Teacher IO did not give self-assessment because of time limitation. It was line with Siow (2015) who stated that self-assessment would make extra time. Time-consuming was the main concern for teachers. Teacher IO perceived that self-assessment spend more time in learning English because the implementation of self-assessment at the end of learning made additional time for teaching and learning. It was also in line with Aliningsih and Sofwan (2015) finding which stated that the teachers had positive perceptions about authentic assessment but they perceived insufficient time, large numbers of students, and also complicated administration. It was also supported by Refnaldi and Moria (2017); Rawlusk (2018) who stated that teachers rarely implemented self-assessment in their classroom. The students assessed their work following a guide provided by their teachers.

In order to know the students' understanding, Teacher IO walked around the students. He checked their writing one by one. If the students had questions, they would ask him. Then, Teacher IO explained the unknown information to them. According to O'Malley & Pierce (1996, p.139) in conferencing, teachers discuss with students individually about the process how they write. At the end, Teacher IO discussed the students' writing generally.

Table 2. Assessing Students' Analyzing Skill by Teacher SS

No	The implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' analyzing skill	Teacher SS	
		Find the fact the conditional sentence type 1	
		Yes	No
1	Teacher gives the prompts of the writing concerning on analyzing the problem.	√	
2	Teacher selects the rubrics of analyzing the problem.	√	
3	Teacher shares the rubrics with students about how to score the students' activities including analyzing the problem.		√
4	Teacher indentifies the benchmark papers	√	
5	Teacher reviews how students write	√	
6	Teacher provides time and instructional support for self-assessment and peer assessment	√	
7	Teacher introduces self-assessment gradually to students		√
8	Teacher discusses the writing and gives feedback how to analyze the problem.	√	

Based on Table 2, it can be seen that authentic assessment suggested by O'Malley and Teacher SS implemented six activities of Pierce (1996). She gave the students the prompt

about the task that would be done. Then, Teacher SS did not share the students the rubric about criteria that would be assessed by her because she said that she believed that the criteria existed in students' mind before doing every task. However, Teacher SS had criteria in rubric as guidance to assess the students' writing. The rubric was analytical rubric. She used it because of the agreement among English teachers in that school. Han and Huang (2017) finding stated that holistic and analytic scoring rubrics did not have a significant impact on the rating of the EFL essay. Both analytic and holistic scoring rubrics helped teachers in assessing the students' writing through criteria existed. The rubric of Teacher SS was about content, grammar, and vocabulary.

Teacher SS asked the students to do the task of finding the fact from the conditional sentence Type 1. During doing their writing, Teacher SS provided the students the examples related to the conditional sentence Type 1. She provided many examples of it in order to do the task. Then, Teacher SS reviewed their writing one by one. She walked around them in order to get closer to her students. Besides, she wanted to know the students' progress in doing the task. Then, the students would ask her if they had many hesitations. By scaffolding in learning,

teachers and students would obtain the advantages; it gave information for the teacher about the students' ability and the students knew the unknown knowledge related to the topic.

Teacher SS did not give self-assessment form to the students because of the time limitation. This finding contradicts from the findings of Heidarian (2016); Nimehchisalem, Chye, and Singh (2014) which stated that using self-assessment helped students to be more active in their writing because the students corrected their own writing, they could find their weakness and improve it. However, Teacher SS was more interested in asking the students classically and walked around them. By these ways, Teacher SS would know the students' progress directly. Besides, learners were agreed with teacher assistance in assessment more than their fellow students (Chaqmaqchee, 2015).

After finishing the writing, Teacher SS asked the students to submit their writing to her. Then, Teacher SS assessed their writing about this task.

Lastly, Teacher SS discussed their writing about the wrong answer generally. It also gave feedback to them about the conditional sentence Type 1.

Table 3. Assessing Students' Evaluating Skill by Teacher IO

No	The implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' evaluating skill	Teacher IO	
		Learning activity 1: answer the questions based on the text.	
		Yes	No
1	Teacher gives the prompts of the writing concerning on evaluating the problem.	√	
2	Teacher selects the rubrics of evaluating the problem.	√	
3	Teacher shares the rubrics with students about how to score the students' activities including evaluating the problem.		√
4	Teacher indentifies the benchmark papers.	√	
5	Teacher reviews how students write	√	
6	Teacher provides time and instructional support for self-assessment and peer assessment	√	
7	Teacher introduces self-assessment gradually to students		√
8	Teacher discusses the writing and gives feedback how to evaluate the problem.	√	

The Implementation of Authentic Assessment to Assess Students' Evaluating Skill

The second research question comprises the implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' evaluating skill in writing by Teacher IO and Teacher SS. In Teacher IO's class, evaluating skill employed students to do the learning activities 1 about the invitation letter. Meanwhile, Teacher SS asked students to write the meaning as the example of conditional sentence Type 1. These are presented in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3 shows the implementation of authentic assessment in analyzing skill by Teacher IO. It can be seen that Teacher IO asked the students to do the task in the *Units of Self-Learning Activities*. It was about answering the question based on the text presented before. The questions were appropriate questions because it involved the lower and higher cognitive level of Bloom Taxonomy. It triggered the students' Lower and Higher Order Thinking Skills. This finding was in line with Kusuma, Rosisdin, Abdurrahman, and Suyatna (2017) finding which stated that the instrument of HOTS helped students in their higher-order thinking ability as assessment for learning. It can be seen that 50.2 % of students had the HOTS ability amount.

Before the students doing the task, Teacher IO provided the students with the prompts to do the task briefly. He explained the conditions that would be done by them. He provided the students the time to do the task. Then, he did not share the students the rubric but he had rubric containing the criteria to assess students' writing. The criteria were about content, vocabulary, coherence and grammar. Almost all rubrics focused on content. Teachers IO focused on content to assess the students' writing because it was an important point of the students' writing. Teacher IO tended to use analytic scoring rubric than a holistic scoring rubric. It was in line with Alsakhi (2019)

finding that analytic scoring rubric should be adopted due to its benefits in comparison to a holistic scoring rubric. It empowered a teacher to become more directly involved with each student.

Teacher IO provided them with the examples about the formal invitation. He also explained the structure and the function of the formal invitation. Then, Teacher IO walked around the students to know their progress. Teacher IO checked their attendance and checked their writing. If there was a mistake, Teacher IO guided them to make good outline. Formally, Teacher IO did not implement self-assessment for the students because it spent more time. Rukmini and Saputri (2017) finding stated that the challenges of implementation authentic assessment were time limitation and scoring complexity. The important point in teaching and learning was time because, without time, teaching and learning become more complex activities. Then, the allotted time was inadequate to cover all students' performance. Therefore, Teacher IO overcame it by walking around the students to monitor their understanding. Then, the students asked him if there were questions. It motivated the students' confidence by communicating their understanding of their teacher. Next, Teacher IO explained it intensely. After finishing their writing, the students submitted it to Teacher IO in order to be assessed by him based on a rubric that had been made before. He assessed the students' writing objectively.

Lastly, Teacher IO discussed the students' writing about punctuation and grammar generally because these aspects always become the mistakes in students' writing. Personally, he discussed the writing to the students about their mindset in doing a task. Teacher IO sought a source of the mistakes by guiding the students' thinking in writing an outline.

Table 4. Assessing Students' Evaluating Skill by Teacher SS

No	The implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' evaluating skill	Teacher SS	
		Write the meaning of conditional sentences	
		Yes	No
1	Teacher gives the prompts of the writing concerning on evaluating the problem.	√	
2	Teacher selects the rubrics of evaluating the problem.	√	
3	Teacher shares the rubrics with students about how to score the students' activities including evaluating the problem.		√
4	Teacher identifies the benchmark papers.	√	
5	Teacher reviews how students write	√	
6	Teacher provides time and instructional support for self-assessment and peer assessment	√	
7	Teacher introduces self-assessment gradually to students		√
8	Teacher discusses the writing and gives feedback how to evaluate the problem.	√	

Based on Table 4, it can be seen that Teacher SS asked students to do a task in the *Unit of Self-Learning Activities*. The task was about writing the meanings of some conditional sentences Type 1. The sentences of the task included Higher Order Thinking Skills. Therefore, it motivated students' thinking to evaluate and decide the best meaning to these conditional sentences. The sentences in the task were appropriate sentence because the documents observation on items indicated that the items had appropriate material, construction, and language aspect. It also measured the cognitive level based on Bloom Taxonomy revised by Anderson and Karthwohl (2001) such as analyzing, evaluating, and creating.

Before doing a task, Teacher SS provided students with the prompt about conditional sentences Type 1. She also gave them time to do the task. Nevertheless, Teacher SS did not share the students the scoring rubrics about the criteria that would be assessed by her because she had already shared the rubric in the previous grade. Nonetheless, she said that she believed that the students had remembered about the criteria when they are doing the task. However, she had a scoring rubric to assess the students' writing. The rubric consisted of content, grammar, and vocabulary. These criteria guided Teacher SS to

assess the students' writing in every task. By the rubric, Teacher SS could avoid the subjectivity. Therefore, the students had a different score on each task.

Teacher SS gave the students the examples about the conditional sentence type 1 and the meaning toward it. It made the students more understand about the task that would be done by them. Then, they could construct the best writing regarding the correct structure of the correct examples. Afterwards, Teacher SS reviewed the students' writing by checking it one by one. She walked around to the students in order to know the students' progress. According to Teacher SS, it substituted the self-assessment activities. Teacher SS did not implement self-assessment because of time limitation. This finding contradicts from the findings of Fung and Mei (2015); Ratminingsih, Marhaeni, and Vigayanti (2018) that using self-assessment was powerful and beneficial as well as giving and receiving feedback. Besides, Teacher SS was not familiar with self-assessment. Although Self or peer assessment existed in English book, Teacher SS rarely used it. The finding was in line with Rawlusk's (2018) survey which stated that teachers rarely used self-assessment in their classroom. Therefore they had no experience of it. Hence, Teacher SS was more interested in

walking around to the students to monitor their understanding. Then, she explained materials in order to understand by the students. After submitting the students' writing, Teacher SS assessed their writing by concerning about the scoring rubrics made by her. It guided her to give the best score to their writing. Lastly, Teacher SS discussed the students' writing to confirm their understanding.

The Implementation of Authentic Assessment to Assess Students' Creating Skill

The third research question explains the implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' creating skill. Creating skill is the higher cognitive level of Bloom Taxonomy. In creating skill, Teacher IO implemented the authentic assessment in creating a wedding invitation letter. Meanwhile, Teacher SS implemented the authentic assessment in creating a dialogue about conditional sentences Type 1. The implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' creating skill is presented in Table 5 and Table 6.

Table 5 shows the implementation of authentic assessment in creating skill by Teacher IO. It can be seen that Teacher IO provided the students with the prompt about doing the task it also included time to do the task. The item of the task was an appropriate instruction because it had good material, construction, and language use. It measured the students' Higher Order Thinking Skills because the items specified the level of cognitive based on Bloom Taxonomy revised by Anderson and Karthwohl (2001). Then, Teacher IO gave a scoring rubric about the criteria that would be assessed. The rubric was analytic scoring rubric. By using the analytic scoring rubric, teachers gave feedback toward the students' writing directly. It was in line with Alshaki's (2019) finding that an analytic, rather than holistic scoring rubric would allow greater contextual-based learning, and that elimination of cross-grading would empower a teacher to

become more directly involved with each student. The rubric involved criteria such as content, grammatical, artificial form because this activity demanded the students to use their creative thinking in making a wedding invitation letter by involving their sense of art. Therefore, they should use good imagination in doing the wedding invitation letter.

Teacher IO provided them with the examples of the wedding invitation from local and international invitation in order to motivate the students' imagination. Then, Teacher IO reviewed the students' writing. It included self-assessment based on Teacher IO perception. Therefore, he did not implement self-assessment formally because of time limitation. It was in line with Aliningsih and Sofwan (2015); Rukmini and Saputri (2017) finding which stated that the teachers had positive responses of authentic assessment, but they were conscious that the challenges of implementation authentic assessment were time limitation and scoring complexity. It was also supported by Metin (2013) and Idham, Nadrun, Darmawan (2015) finding who stated that they did not implement self-assessment because of bias on them. Besides, using many forms of assessment in the classroom, made it difficult to implement. Then, the students were naturally doing self-assessment by comparing their score and their performance. Teacher IO changed the self-assessment activity by walking around the students to control their writing one by one. By walking around, he knew their understanding about the topic; to what extent they achieved their understanding related to the topic learn by them. Then, Teacher IO knew the students' ability in doing their writing. For the last, Teacher IO discussed the students' writing generally. It was about punctuation and grammatical structure. He corrected the students' mindset with constructing a good outline personally because he guided the students who had intricate thinking.

Table 5. Assessing Students' Creating Skill by Teacher IO

No	The implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' creating skill	Teacher IO	
		Create a wedding invitation	
		Yes	No
1	Teacher gives the prompts of the writing concerning on creating the problem.	√	
2	Teacher selects the rubrics of creating the problem.	√	
3	Teacher shares the rubrics with students about how to score the students' activities including creating the problem.	√	
4	Teacher indentifies the benchmark papers	√	
5	Teacher reviews how students write	√	
6	Teacher provides time and instructional support for self-assessment and peer assessment	√	
7	Teacher introduces self-assessment gradually to students		√
8	Teacher discusses the writing and gives feedback how to creating the problem.	√	

Table 6. Assessing Students' Creating Skill by Teacher SS

No	The implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' creating skill	Teacher SS	
		Make a dialog about conditional sentence type 1	
		Yes	No
1	Teacher gives the prompts of the writing concerning on creating the problem.	√	
2	Teacher selects the rubrics of creating the problem.	√	
3	Teacher shares the rubrics with students about how to score the students' activities including creating the problem.		√
4	Teacher indentifies the benchmark papers	√	
5	Teacher reviews how students write	√	
6	Teacher provides time and instructional support for self-assessment and peer assessment	√	
7	Teacher introduces self-assessment gradually to students		√
8	Teacher discusses the writing and gives feedback how to creating the problem.	√	

Based on Table 6, it can be seen that Teacher SS asked students to create or make a dialogue about conditional sentences type 1 in pairs. In this activity, the students were demanded to use their Higher Order Thinking Skills in doing this task. The students should create a dialogue in product assessment. The

instruction of task included good instruction because Teacher SS used appropriate material, construction, and language use. It also used the contextual stimuli to the students because the task presented the example of a real-life context situation. Before doing a task, Teacher SS provided the students with the prompt about the

conditions in doing a task. It included the time in doing it but Teacher SS did not share the scoring rubrics to them because she said that she believed that they remembered about criteria that would be assessed by her. However, Teacher SS had criteria in the scoring rubrics to assess the students' product. She used analytic scoring rubric because it existed in the lesson plan and agreed in this school. It was in line with Refnaldi, Zaim and Moria (2017) finding who stated that analytic scoring rubric was simple and easy to be implemented because most of the teachers did not use certain scoring rubric since it was complicated.

Teacher SS gave the students the examples of a dialogue of conditional sentences type 1. It was done to make they had an illustration about the dialogue that would be done by them. Then, Teacher SS reviewed the students' writing by checking it one by one. If the students had a misunderstanding, she explained it intensely. She walked around the students to know their understanding instead of implemented self-assessment formally. It was not in line with Shatri and Zabeli (2018); Azarnoosh (2013); Siow (2015) finding who stated that using self-assessment stimulated the students' critical thinking. Students would think more and become analytical. After students had submitted their writing, Teacher SS discussed their writing generally. It was done to confirm their understanding.

The Solutions to Overcome the Difficulties

The implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' Higher Order Thinking Skills by Teacher IO and Teacher SS encountered difficulties but they proposed solutions to overcome these difficulties in implementing the authentic assessment. Teacher IO was conscious that in implementing authentic assessment encountered some difficulties such as large classes and time limitation. It was in line with Aliningsih and Sofwan (2015); Rukmini and Saputri (2017) stated that teacher had a positive perception about authentic assessment but allotted time was inadequate to cover all students

to performance because each student required their time to perform totally.

Teacher IO had many classes in teaching English, therefore he was difficult to implement different rubric on each task and implement self-assessment formally. Therefore, he had the solution to overcome the difficulties. Teacher IO made the same criteria on each topic but it depended on the topic that would be learned. He also modified the learning activities based on classroom condition. Therefore, he was flexible in his teaching and learning process.

In order to overcome the time limitation in implementing self-assessment, Teacher IO walked around the students to know their progress. He monitored the students' writing by giving a mark on each activity. By walking around, he knew the students' ability. Then, it motivated the students' confidence by communicating their understanding of Teacher IO. Teacher IO also guided them to make a good outline before the students doing their writing. It trained the students' thinking of doing every task. Patiently, Teacher IO explained the students' misunderstanding in order to make the students could achieve their understanding well. Then, Teacher IO did not demand the students to use their hard thinking continuously because it depressed the students' motivation. To attract the students' motivation, Teacher IO used pictures in each topic. It was in line with Lestari, Bharati, and Rukmini (2018) finding which stated that media such as a picture or short video could stimulate the students to be critical in thinking. In developing project-based writing assessment, they used comic with to improve the students' critical thinking.

Turning to Teacher SS difficulties, she encountered some difficulties in implementing authentic assessment to assess students' Higher Order Thinking Skills in writing such as time limitation, students' motivation, and constructs the appropriate items. Teacher SS did not share the rubric because she said that she believed that the students remembered the criteria that would be assessed. Nevertheless, she had a rubric to assess the students' knowledge and skills. In fact, the students could do these tasks well although

they had a misunderstanding about the topic. Then, Teacher SS did not implement self-assessment formally because of time limitation. Siow (2015); Aliningsih and Sofwan (2015); Rukmini and Saputri (2017) stated that the implementation of authentic assessment spent more time. It could be seen that self-assessment incurs extra time. The activity of self-assessment which separated from learning activities made teacher required additional time to accomplish the activities and give feedback to the students. To overcome it, Teacher SS walked around to the students in order to know their understanding. She was interested in walking around the students because both Teacher SS and the students could construct communication intensely. Therefore, the students would ask her if there was a misunderstanding. Then, she explained it well.

Another difficulty was motivation. In English learning and teaching, Teacher SS perceived that the students had low motivation to use English in a real-life situation. Therefore, Teacher SS motivated the students by illustrating the English necessity in a real-life situation. She explained the necessity of TOEFL in higher education and in certain University. The students should have a good score if they wanted to join in the University. Therefore, students should focus on learning English. Besides, Teacher SS gave an explanation about the requirements of a certain University. She explained that the requirement such as application letter which was considered in certain University. Therefore, the students should concern about the structure of the application letter.

The last difficulty was to construct an appropriate item. Nowadays, the test in Senior High School used CBT (Computer-Based Test). In CBT involved many items that separated with others. The items in CBT were different from the other tests. Therefore, it made Teacher SS felt difficult to seek the appropriate items in order to construct a test for the students. Based on Abosalem (2016), many teachers were not trained in how to construct this type of questions. To overcome the difficulties, Teacher SS looked for the items in other books and other items related to National examination because Teacher SS

wanted to trigger the students' motivation in doing the test in accordance with the National examination. She sought other books related to the topic that would be discussed because she believed that the books had the same material with others.

The difficulty in implementing authentic assessment of these two English teachers was time limitation because the time allotted did not cover the learning activities included authentic assessment activities. It was realized by Teacher SS and Teacher IO but they proposed solutions to overcome the difficulties in order to make teaching and learning successfully. It was done by them in order to make the students achieved their knowledge effectively.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that in implementing authentic assessment to assess students' Higher Order Thinking Skills, Teacher IO and Teacher SS implemented it well although they did not implement some of the activities in assessing writing. In assessing students' writing, they did not share a rubric about the criteria that would be assessed by him. They did not implement self-assessment in his classroom because of time limitation. To change this self-assessment activity, they walked around to the students to monitor the students' writing. They proposed solutions to overcome the difficulties in implementing authentic assessment to assess students' Higher Order Thinking Skills. In implementing authentic assessment, Teacher IO encountered difficulties about time limitation in implementing self-assessment. Therefore, he walked around the students one by one to know the students' understanding. Meanwhile, Teacher SS encountered difficulties about time limitation, motivation, and constructs the appropriate items for students. Dealing with the time limitation, she walked around the students to monitor the students' progress. Then, in order to motivate the students' learning, she illustrated the real condition in Universities and working situation. The students would aware of English. For the

last, to construct appropriate items, Teacher SS looked for other books on internet to make appropriate items.

For future researchers, it is expected to analyze the implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' Higher Order Thinking Skills based on English Teachers' views in other schools such as in Senior High School and Vocational School. Additionally, the present study focuses on writing skill and probably it has many weaknesses. Hence, future researchers are expected to conduct research related to the topic in other skills such as speaking, reading or listening. Finally, it is possible for them to compare the implementation of authentic assessment to assess students' Higher Order Thinking Skills in different ways.

In order to assess the students' writing, English teachers can check it one by one then making conference between teacher and students. Besides, they can use the alternative authentic assessments. The one alternative authentic assessment that can be used is the portfolio. By using Portfolio, they can assess the content of writing then they give comment on students' work in order to improve the students' understanding of the topic that has been discussed. Unlike single test scores and multiple-choice tests, Portfolio provides a multidimensional perspective on student's growth over time.

REFERENCES

- Abosalem, Y. (2016). Assessment techniques and students' higher-order thinking skills. *International Journal of Secondary Education*, 4(1), 1-11. doi: 10.11648/j.ijsedu.20160401.11
- Aliningsih, F., & Sofwan, A. (2015). English teacher's perceptions and practices of authentic assessment. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 10(1), 19-27. doi: 10.15294/lc.v10i1.4154
- Alshakhi, A. (2019). Revisiting the writing assessment process at a saudienglish language institute: Problems and solutions. *English Language Teaching*, 12(1), 176-185. doi: 10.5539/elt.v12n1p176
- Azarnoosh, M. (2013). Peer assessment in an EFL context: attitudes and friendship bias. *Language Testing in Asia*, 3(1), 11. Retrieved from <https://languagetestingasia.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/2229-0443-3-11>
- Brown, D. (2004). *Language Assessment principles: principles and classroom practices*. London: Longman.
- Chamaqchee, Z.A. (2015). Empowering learning: Students and teachers outlook on peer assessment for oral presentation. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(27), 75-81. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=chamaqchee+2015+empowering+learning%3A+students+and+teachers+outlook+on+peer+assessment+for+oral+presentation&btnG=#d=gs_qabs&u=%23%3D-tyib9xR3AZ7IJ
- Han, T., & Huang, J. (2017). Examining the impact of scoring methods on the institutional efl writing assessment: A turkish perspective. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 53, 112-147. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1153666>
- Heidarian, N. (2016). Investigating the effect of using self-assessment on Iranian efl learners' writing. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(28), 80-89. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1118573>
- Huang, S. C. (2016). No longer a teacher monologue--involving efl writing learners in teachers' assessment and feedback processes. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 13(1), 1-31. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1108196>
- Lestari, T., Bharati, D. A. L., & Rukmini, D. (2018). Developing project-based writing assessment module to stimulate students' critical thinking and creativity. *English Education Journal*, 8(4), 499-507. doi:<https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v8i4.25809>

- Marhaeni, A. A. I. N., &Dantes, N. (2014). Toward authentic language assessment: A case in indonesianefl classrooms. *In Official Conference Proceedings of the European Conference on Language Learning 2014*. Retrieved from https://papers.iafor.org/wp-content/uploads/papers/ecll2014/ECLL2014_02956.pdf
- Mellati, M., &Khademi, M. (2018). Exploring teachers' assessment literacy: Impact on learners' writing achievements and implications for teacher development. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(6), 1. doi: 10.14221/ajte.2018v43n6.1
- Mohamed, R., &Lebar, O. (2017). Authentic assessment in assessing higher order thinking skills. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 466-476. doi: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i2/2021
- Natalia, S.A., Mahraeni, A.A., &Dantes, N. (2013). Analysis of authenticity of teachers' made assessment and its contribution to students' english achievement in elementary schools in buleleng regency. *E-Journal Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesa*, 1. Retrieved from <http://119.252.161.254/e-journal/index.php/jpbi/article/view/727>
- Nimehchisalem, V., Chye, D. Y. S., & Jaswant Singh, S. K. A. (2014). A self-assessment checklist for undergraduate students' argumentative writing. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 5(1), 65-80. doi:10.7575/aiac.all.v.5n.1p.65
- Obeid, R. (2017). Second language writing and assessment: Voices from within the Saudi EFL Context. *English Language Teaching*, 10(6), 174-181. doi: 10.5539/elt.v10n6p174
- O'Malley, J., & Pierce, L. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners: practical approaches for teachers*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Ratminingsih, N. M., Marhaeni, A. A. I. N., &Vigayanti, L. P. D. (2018). Self-assessment: The effect on students' independence and writing competence. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(3), 277-290. doi: <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11320a>
- Refnaldi, R., Zaim, M., &Moria, E. (2017). Teachers' need for authentic assessment to assess writing skill at grade vii of junior high schools in telukkuantan. *Fifth International Seminar on English Language and Teaching (ISELT 2017)*. Atlantis Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2991/iselt-17.2017.32>
- Rukmini, D., &Saputri, L. A. D. E. (2017). The authentic assessment to measure students' english productive skills based on 2013 curriculum. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 263-273. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8128>
- Shatri, G.S., &Zabeli, N. (2018). Perception of students and teachers about the forms and student self-assessment activities in the classroom during the formative assessment. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 9(2), 28-46.
- Siow, L. F. (2018). Students' perceptions on self- and peer assessment in enhancing learning experience. *MOJES: Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(2), 21-35. Retrieved from <http://ajba.um.edu.my/index.php/MOJES/article/view/12692>
- Undang-UndangRepublik Indonesia nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentangSistem Pendidikan Nasional
- Widana, I. W., Parwata, I. M. Y., Parmithi, N. N., Jayantika, I. G. A. T., Sukendra, K., &Sumandya, I. W. (2018). Higher order thinking skills assessment towards critical thinking on mathematics lesson. *International journal of social sciences and humanities*, 2(1), 24-32. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.29332/ijssh.v2n1.74>