



Assessing Writing Proficiency in Bilingual Vocational High School Students: A Case Study at SMKN 1 Tapak Tuan Grade X

Yulita Halim

SMK Negeri 1 Tapaktuan

*Corresponding Author's Email: ssyulitahalimhum@gmail.com

Received: 11 29, 2025 | Accepted: 12 09, 2025 | Published: 12 11, 2025

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the writing proficiency of bilingual students in Grade X at SMKN 1 Tapak Tuan, a vocational high school implementing a bilingual instructional model. The research aims to assess students' overall writing performance and identify the most frequent linguistic issues that influence their proficiency. Using a mixed-method design, data were collected through a writing test, analytic scoring rubric, interviews, and classroom observations. The students' written texts were evaluated across five components: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. In addition, linguistic errors were categorized using the Error Analysis framework consisting of omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. The findings indicate that most students are positioned at the fair proficiency level, with significant challenges in grammar accuracy, vocabulary range, and organization. Misformation and omission emerged as the most dominant error types, suggesting strong L1 interference and limited exposure to English writing conventions. Qualitative data reveal that students' difficulties are influenced by low confidence, limited academic vocabulary, and inconsistent bilingual support. The study highlights the need for more explicit writing instruction, targeted feedback, and increased English input within vocational bilingual contexts. Implications for teaching practices and curriculum refinement are also discussed.

Keywords: writing proficiency, bilingual students, vocational high school, error analysis, L1 interference

How to Cite:

Yulita Halim. (2025). Assessing Writing Proficiency in Bilingual Vocational High School Students: A Case Study at SMKN 1 Tapak Tuan Grade X. *Educational Journal*, 1(2), 281-293. <https://doi.org/10.63822/x0ge7233>

INTRODUCTION

Writing proficiency is widely recognized as one of the most challenging skills for learners of English as a foreign language, largely because it requires the integration of cognitive, linguistic, and metacognitive abilities in a single performance. Writing involves generating ideas, selecting appropriate vocabulary, applying correct grammatical structures, and organizing text coherently while maintaining accuracy and clarity. These demands make writing fundamentally different from receptive skills such as reading or listening, and students often struggle to express their thoughts effectively in a second language. Recent research underscores how writing requires substantial cognitive processing and continuous strategic regulation, which makes it especially demanding for learners in EFL contexts (Zhu, Yang, & Yan, 2024).

In Indonesia, writing remains one of the weakest skills among secondary and vocational students, despite continuous formal English instruction from elementary levels. Many students still struggle to construct well-organized paragraphs, to apply grammar accurately, and to express ideas fluently in written English. These challenges are even more evident in vocational schools, where curriculum emphasis tends to be placed on practical and technical competencies rather than on advanced linguistic or academic communication skills. As a result, students often lack sustained exposure to writing tasks and opportunities to improve their written accuracy and fluency. Recent evidence highlights that limited writing practice and insufficient feedback continue to hinder Indonesian learners' writing development in vocational settings (Yuliana, 2024).

Bilingual learning models, adopted in some Indonesian vocational schools to enhance English exposure, offer potential benefits but are often implemented inconsistently. Ideally, bilingual instruction should provide students with meaningful opportunities to use English in content subjects, reinforcing vocabulary and structures needed for written communication. However, in actual implementation, the absence of clear guidelines, uneven teacher proficiency, and lack of bilingual materials can limit students' ability to fully benefit from such programs. These inconsistencies reduce the extent to which bilingual instruction contributes to developing English literacy, including writing proficiency. Studies show that bilingual programs in Indonesia require more structured planning and teacher support to reach their intended outcomes (Hoerudin, 2024).

At SMKN 1 Tapak Tuan, where bilingual elements are applied in certain subjects, preliminary observations indicate substantial variation in students' writing abilities. Many Grade X students produce texts containing frequent grammatical errors, limited lexical variety, and weak organizational cohesion. These issues suggest that bilingual exposure alone is insufficient for improving writing accuracy without systematic writing instruction. Students also appear to rely heavily on literal translation strategies, which lead to misformation of sentences and errors influenced by structures from their first language. Such difficulties indicate the need for more targeted instructional approaches that directly address writing challenges among vocational learners (Barus, 2025).

The multilingual context of Aceh adds additional complexity to students' writing development. Learners often use multiple languages—regional languages, Bahasa Indonesia, and English—resulting in diverse linguistic backgrounds that influence how they process and produce English. Multilingual learners frequently transfer grammatical structures and lexical patterns from their dominant language into English, leading to common error types such as omission, misordering, and addition. Linguistic transfer, especially

negative transfer, continues to be recognized as a major factor affecting writing accuracy among multilingual students in EFL settings (Chuquin, 2025).

Beyond linguistic challenges, writing is shaped by socio-affective and cognitive dimensions. Students may experience anxiety, low confidence, and limited motivation during writing tasks, reducing their ability to engage in planning, drafting, and revising processes. Many vocational school students write only to complete assignments rather than to communicate meaningfully, which restricts opportunities for improvement. Research exploring writing development emphasizes that self-regulation, motivation, and feedback play significant roles in shaping students' writing outcomes, especially in foreign language environments (Zhu et al., 2024).

Vocational school teachers face practical constraints that further hinder writing instruction. Large class sizes, limited time allocation, and heavy teaching loads reduce opportunities to provide individualized feedback. In many cases, teachers adopt corrective methods that prioritize surface-level errors rather than deeper aspects of content or organization. However, recent studies indicate that structured pedagogical interventions—such as scaffolded tasks, guided practice, and peer feedback—can significantly improve writing accuracy and fluency when applied consistently. Such approaches are particularly effective in vocational settings where learners require explicit support (Casinto, 2023).

Writing proficiency holds substantial importance for vocational learners beyond academic assessments. Many vocational fields require graduates to communicate clearly through written forms such as documentation, reports, email communication, and digital correspondence. Employers increasingly value English communication skills as part of workplace readiness, especially in industries connected to tourism, technology, and business services. Strengthening writing ability therefore supports students' employability and professional communication. Studies examining vocational education emphasize the importance of aligning English instruction with practical workplace needs while still fostering core literacy competencies (Rihatmi, 2025).

Despite the critical role of writing in vocational contexts, research focusing specifically on English writing development within bilingual vocational schools in Indonesia remains limited. Most existing studies focus on general high school or university populations, leaving a gap in understanding how bilingual instruction interacts with vocational curricula and student linguistic profiles. There is a growing need for empirical studies that investigate writing challenges, error patterns, and instructional practices specific to vocational bilingual settings. Reviews of bilingual education in Indonesian schools highlight the importance of contextualized research that reflects actual classroom realities (Alawiyah, 2024).

Responding to these gaps, the present study examines the writing proficiency of Grade X students at SMKN 1 Tapak Tuan by combining quantitative assessment and qualitative analysis. Writing samples are evaluated using an analytic scoring rubric that includes content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Complementing the scoring, systematic error analysis is conducted to categorize errors such as omission, addition, misformation, and misordering to better understand their linguistic sources. This approach provides comprehensive insight into students' writing strengths and weaknesses and helps identify internal and external factors contributing to their performance. Recent educational research highlights the value of mixed-methods designs in capturing both numerical outcomes and deeper contextual explanations (Wei et al., 2023).

Based on these findings, the study aims to generate relevant recommendations for teachers and curriculum developers at SMKN 1 Tapak Tuan. By identifying specific error patterns and the challenges that underlie them, the research provides a basis for designing more targeted writing instruction, integrating feedback strategies, and aligning bilingual exposure with writing goals. Ultimately, the study seeks to contribute to improving the overall effectiveness of bilingual vocational education and enhancing students' readiness for academic and professional communication. Studies in vocational language teaching emphasize that context-responsive instructional refinement is essential for sustainable improvement in learner outcomes (Marlina, 2024).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing Proficiency in EFL Contexts

Writing proficiency is a critical component of overall language competence, reflecting not only linguistic knowledge but also cognitive and strategic skills. In EFL contexts, writing is often the most challenging skill for learners due to limited exposure, vocabulary constraints, and difficulties in applying grammatical rules accurately. Research shows that writing proficiency is multidimensional, encompassing content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics (Zhu, Yang, & Yan, 2024). Effective instruction requires not only teaching these components explicitly but also providing meaningful practice opportunities and feedback, which help learners internalize writing conventions.

Challenges of Writing for Vocational High School Students

Vocational high school students face unique challenges compared to general high school students because the curriculum emphasizes practical and technical skills rather than academic literacy. This often results in limited classroom time for extensive writing activities, which reduces opportunities for structured practice and iterative feedback. Empirical studies indicate that vocational learners frequently struggle with organizing ideas, applying grammatical rules, and selecting appropriate vocabulary, especially in extended written texts (Yuliana, 2024). These challenges highlight the importance of context-sensitive instructional strategies that address both academic writing and the specific communication needs of vocational learners.

Bilingual Education and Writing Development

Bilingual education has been widely promoted in Indonesia to enhance English proficiency by integrating content and language learning. Bilingual approaches can increase students' exposure to English, improve language awareness, and promote cognitive flexibility. However, the effectiveness of bilingual programs depends on teacher proficiency, curriculum design, and the availability of resources. Studies in Indonesian vocational schools indicate that inconsistent implementation of bilingual programs often leads to over-reliance on L1 in writing, resulting in literal translations and structural errors (Hoerudin, 2024). Successful bilingual writing instruction requires systematic scaffolding, teacher guidance, and alignment between language and content objectives.

Error Analysis in L2 Writing

Error analysis (EA) is a widely used approach to examine L2 learners' writing performance. By systematically identifying, classifying, and interpreting errors, EA provides insights into learners' linguistic knowledge, areas of difficulty, and sources of interference. Common error types in EFL writing include omission, addition, misformation, and misordering, which often result from L1 transfer, developmental processes, or instructional gaps (Chuquin, 2025). EA not only helps researchers understand error patterns but also guides teachers in designing targeted interventions to improve writing accuracy and fluency.

L1 Influence on L2 Writing

The first language (L1) exerts a significant influence on second language writing. Learners often transfer syntactic structures, vocabulary choices, and discourse patterns from L1 into L2, which can lead to both positive and negative transfer. Negative transfer, or interference, is especially common when the L1 and L2 differ structurally, as is the case with Bahasa Indonesia and English. Studies highlight that identifying L1-induced errors can inform instructional strategies that explicitly address these interferences and support learners' development of target language norms (Barus, 2025).

Writing Strategies and Self-Regulation

Writing is not purely linguistic; it is also a cognitive and self-regulated process. Successful writers plan, draft, revise, and monitor their own output, applying strategies to enhance clarity, coherence, and correctness. Research shows that teaching writing strategies, including self-monitoring and peer feedback, can significantly improve L2 writing performance. Students who receive instruction in planning, revising, and editing tend to produce more accurate and coherent texts (Zhu et al., 2024). In vocational contexts, integrating strategy instruction into classroom practice is particularly beneficial given limited exposure to extended writing tasks.

Integration of Technology in Writing Instruction

The use of technology, such as automated writing evaluation (AWE) tools, digital platforms, and online feedback systems, has been shown to enhance L2 writing development. These tools can provide immediate feedback on grammar, vocabulary, and organization, helping students identify errors and practice revisions independently. Recent studies report that integrating AWE in vocational school contexts increases writing accuracy, motivates learners, and supplements teacher feedback (Wei et al., 2023). However, technology must be combined with pedagogical guidance to ensure meaningful learning outcomes.

Synthesis and Research Gaps

Overall, the literature indicates that writing proficiency among bilingual vocational learners is influenced by multiple factors: instructional quality, bilingual program design, L1 interference, self-regulation, and technological support. Despite growing attention to EFL writing, research specifically targeting vocational bilingual schools in Indonesia remains limited. Most existing studies focus on general secondary or tertiary contexts, leaving gaps regarding the interaction between vocational curricula, bilingual instruction, and students' linguistic backgrounds. This gap justifies the present study, which

investigates Grade X students at SMKN 1 Tapak Tuan to assess writing proficiency, identify error patterns, and provide actionable insights for instruction.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employs a case study design within the framework of Classroom Action Research (CAR) to assess the writing proficiency of bilingual vocational students. A case study is appropriate because it allows an in-depth examination of the specific context of Grade X students at SMKN 1 Tapak Tuan, focusing on their linguistic performance, error patterns, and writing challenges. This qualitative-dominant approach is supplemented with quantitative analysis through analytic scoring of writing samples to provide a comprehensive understanding of students' writing proficiency.

The research combines quantitative and qualitative methods in a mixed-methods design. Quantitative data are collected through structured writing assessments, while qualitative data are gathered from classroom observations and semi-structured interviews with students and teachers. This triangulation ensures reliability and validity by providing multiple perspectives on students' writing performance (Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

Research Setting

The study was conducted at SMKN 1 Tapak Tuan, Aceh Selatan, a vocational high school that implements bilingual elements in its curriculum. Grade X students were chosen as participants because they are at the initial stage of vocational training, making them suitable for analyzing foundational writing proficiency and the effects of bilingual exposure. The school offers courses in various vocational streams, including office administration, accounting, and computer network engineering, which provides a context for both academic and vocational writing tasks.

Participants

The participants of this study were Grade X students majoring in vocational programs, totaling approximately 30 students. Purposive sampling was used to select students who regularly participated in bilingual instruction and English classes. Both male and female students were included to ensure diversity in the sample. The participants' language backgrounds vary, including regional languages, Bahasa Indonesia, and English, which is consistent with the bilingual context of the school.

Research Instruments

Writing Test

An analytic writing test was developed to evaluate students' proficiency across five components: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Students were asked to write a narrative essay on a given topic within a 60-minute period. The essays were then scored using a rubric adapted from Jacobs et al. (1981), which allows for systematic assessment of each component. The analytic approach provides more detailed information on students' strengths and weaknesses than holistic scoring.

Classroom Observation

Classroom observations were conducted to record students' writing behaviors, classroom interactions, and teacher feedback. A structured observation checklist was used to capture the frequency and types of writing support provided, student engagement, and error correction practices. Observations were conducted over four consecutive English class sessions, ensuring sufficient data to identify patterns. Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a subset of 10 students and 2 English teachers. The interviews focused on students' perceptions of bilingual instruction, challenges in writing, strategies used during writing, and teachers' approaches to error correction and feedback. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed for qualitative analysis.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection followed three main steps:

- a. Writing Sample Collection – Students completed the writing test under controlled conditions. The essays were collected for scoring and error analysis.
- b. Classroom Observation – Observers recorded students' writing processes, including how they planned, drafted, and revised their texts. Teacher interventions and feedback were also documented.
- c. Interviews – Interviews were conducted individually to explore students' experiences, perceptions, and self-reported strategies for writing. Teachers were also interviewed regarding their instructional methods and bilingual teaching practices.

All data were collected over a two-week period to ensure consistency and reduce external influences.

Data Analysis

Quantitative Analysis

The students' essays were scored using the analytic rubric, and the scores for each component were tabulated to calculate mean, median, and standard deviation. These statistical measures were used to determine the overall proficiency level of the students and to identify which components (content, organization, vocabulary, language use, mechanics) were most challenging.

Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative data from classroom observations and interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis. Transcriptions were coded to identify recurring themes related to writing challenges, strategies, and classroom support. Observational notes were triangulated with interview data to ensure accuracy and reliability of the findings.

Error Analysis

Error analysis was applied to the students' essays to classify linguistic errors into four categories: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. Each error was further distinguished as global (affecting overall meaning) or local (affecting sentence-level accuracy) to provide detailed insights into the types of difficulties students faced. This approach helps in identifying specific areas for instructional improvement.

Validity and Reliability

To ensure validity, the instruments were reviewed by two experts in EFL teaching and writing assessment. The writing rubric was piloted on a small group of students outside the main sample to ensure clarity and appropriateness. Reliability of the essay scoring was verified through inter-rater reliability, with two independent raters scoring the same essays and achieving a high level of agreement (Cohen's kappa > 0.80). Triangulation of data from writing tests, observations, and interviews further strengthened the credibility of the findings.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from the school administration and informed consent was obtained from all participants and their parents. Participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity, and they were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time without consequence. Data were securely stored and used solely for research purposes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of Students' Writing Proficiency

The writing proficiency of Grade X students was evaluated using an analytic rubric covering content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The quantitative scoring revealed that students' overall writing performance was moderate, with mean scores ranging from 60% to 72% across the components. Students performed best in content, demonstrating the ability to generate ideas relevant to the narrative topics, whereas language use and mechanics scored lowest, indicating persistent grammatical and orthographic challenges (Zhu, Yang, & Yan, 2024).

The findings suggest that while students can express ideas adequately, they struggle to encode them accurately in English, reflecting the combined influence of limited exposure, L1 transfer, and insufficient targeted writing instruction. This pattern aligns with previous research on vocational EFL learners, who often prioritize content over formal language accuracy (Yuliana, 2024).

Analysis by Writing Components

Content

The content component received the highest scores (mean = 72%). Most students were able to develop a clear narrative, maintain relevance to the assigned topic, and include basic elements of a story such as characters, setting, and events. This indicates adequate cognitive and imaginative skills. However, some students produced simplistic or underdeveloped plots, suggesting the need for more guided practice in structuring narratives (Barus, 2025).

Table 1. Average Scores of Writing Components

Component	Mean (%)
Content	72
Organization	68
Vocabulary	65
Language Use	60
Mechanics	62

Organization

Organization scores were moderate (mean = 68%). While students generally adhered to the typical narrative structure (introduction, development, conclusion), transitions between paragraphs were often weak, and coherence markers (e.g., connectors, sequencing words) were inconsistently used. Classroom observations indicated that students relied heavily on rote patterns rather than understanding the function of cohesive devices (Hoerudin, 2024).

Vocabulary

Vocabulary scores averaged 65%, reflecting limited lexical variety and occasional misuse of words. Common issues included incorrect word choice, literal translation from Bahasa Indonesia, and repetitive vocabulary. Interviews revealed that students often struggled to retrieve appropriate words during timed writing tasks, highlighting the need for vocabulary enrichment and practice in contextual usage (Yuliana, 2024).

Language Use

Language use, including grammar and sentence structure, received the lowest scores (mean = 60%). Frequent errors involved verb tense, subject-verb agreement, preposition use, and article omission, reflecting both L1 interference and developmental challenges. Error analysis indicated that these errors were persistent across students and affected clarity in sentences, confirming findings from prior studies on EFL vocational learners (Chuquin, 2025).

Mechanics

Mechanics, including punctuation, capitalization, and spelling, averaged 62%. Most students were aware of basic punctuation rules, but errors in capitalization of proper nouns and sentence-initial letters were common. Misspellings often resulted from phonetic transcription based on L1 pronunciation, reflecting limited proofreading and self-monitoring strategies (Zhu et al., 2024).

Error Analysis

A detailed error analysis was conducted to classify the most common linguistic errors. Four categories were used: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering.

- Omission errors included missing articles, prepositions, and verb markers.
- Addition errors involved unnecessary articles or plural markers.
- Misformation errors included incorrect verb forms, tense errors, and improper word formation.
- Misordering errors involved incorrect word sequences or sentence structures.

The analysis showed that misformation was the most frequent error type (34%), followed by omission (28%), misordering (22%), and addition (16%).

This aligns with previous research highlighting that grammatical accuracy is a primary challenge for vocational EFL learners and is influenced by L1 transfer as well as insufficient formal writing instruction (Barus, 2025).

Table 2. Distribution of Error Types

Error Type	Percentage (%)
Misformation	34
Omission	28
Misordering	22
Addition	16

As shown in table 2, misformation was the dominant error type among students, highlighting the need for targeted instruction to address grammatical challenges.

Additionally, errors were categorized as global (affecting overall meaning) or local (sentence-level). Most errors were local, indicating that students could convey the main idea but struggled with surface-level accuracy, which corroborates the analytic rubric results where content scored higher than language use.

Table 3. Distribution of Error Types by Global and Local

Error Type	Global (%)	Local (%)
Misformation	8	26
Omission	5	23
Misordering	4	18
Addition	2	14

Qualitative Findings from Observation and Interviews

Classroom Observations

Observations revealed that students frequently relied on teacher prompts and peer support when planning and drafting their narratives. Teachers provided feedback mainly focused on grammar correction, with limited attention to organization or vocabulary development. Students were often hesitant to self-correct and rarely revised drafts independently, highlighting the need for more scaffolded writing strategies (Wei et al., 2023).

Interviews

Student interviews indicated that learners recognized their own strengths in generating ideas but reported difficulties in structuring sentences, using connectors, and avoiding repetitive vocabulary. Teachers emphasized the challenge of balancing vocational content teaching with English writing instruction, noting time constraints and large class sizes as obstacles. Students also mentioned the influence

of their first language (Bahasa Indonesia or regional languages) on English writing, confirming patterns observed in the error analysis (Hoerudin, 2024).

Discussion

The findings reveal a moderate level of writing proficiency among Grade X students, with clear strengths in content and weaknesses in language use and mechanics. This suggests that while students can develop ideas, they struggle to encode them accurately in English. The predominance of grammatical and lexical errors aligns with research indicating that L1 interference and limited writing practice are major factors affecting vocational learners' writing (Chuquin, 2025).

The study also highlights the role of bilingual instruction, which, although beneficial for vocabulary exposure, does not automatically translate to improved grammatical accuracy or self-regulated writing. Scaffolded instruction, peer feedback, and strategy teaching are therefore essential to enhance students' writing proficiency (Zhu et al., 2024; Wei et al., 2023).

Overall, these results suggest that targeted instructional interventions are necessary in vocational bilingual contexts. Teachers should focus not only on correcting grammatical errors but also on supporting students in planning, organizing, and revising texts, providing opportunities for iterative practice, and integrating technology where appropriate to supplement feedback (Barus, 2025; Hoerudin, 2024).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

This study aimed to assess the writing proficiency of Grade X bilingual vocational students at SMKN 1 Tapak Tuan and to identify common errors and challenges in their English writing. Based on the findings from analytic scoring, error analysis, classroom observations, and interviews, several conclusions can be drawn:

1. **Moderate Writing Proficiency:** Students demonstrated moderate writing proficiency overall, with strengths in content development and weaknesses in language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. While they could generate ideas and maintain relevance in narratives, grammatical accuracy and proper sentence construction remained significant challenges (Zhu, Yang, & Yan, 2024).
2. **Error Patterns:** The most common errors were misformation, omission, misordering, and addition, with misformation (incorrect verb forms, tenses, and sentence structures) being the most frequent. Most errors were local, affecting sentence-level accuracy rather than overall meaning, though some global errors impacted coherence and readability (Chuquin, 2025).
3. **Influence of L1 and Bilingual Instruction:** Students' first language (Bahasa Indonesia or regional languages) influenced their English writing, particularly in grammatical structures and word order. While bilingual exposure provided additional input, it was insufficient alone to improve writing accuracy. Effective writing development requires explicit instruction and guided practice (Hoerudin, 2024).
4. **Instructional and Cognitive Factors:** Observations and interviews revealed that students relied heavily on teacher prompts, demonstrated limited self-regulation, and lacked systematic revision practices. Teachers focused primarily on error correction rather than comprehensive writing strategies,

highlighting the need for scaffolded instruction and explicit teaching of writing strategies (Wei et al., 2023).

5. Vocational Context Considerations: The vocational curriculum emphasizes technical competencies, which limits time and emphasis on English writing. Despite this, writing proficiency remains essential for professional communication, documentation, and workplace readiness, underscoring the importance of integrating writing skill development into vocational education (Yuliana, 2024).

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed:

For Teachers

1. Scaffold Writing Instruction: Teachers should provide structured guidance in planning, drafting, and revising texts, with step-by-step support for grammar, vocabulary, and cohesion.
2. Integrate Writing Strategies: Encourage students to use planning, self-monitoring, and peer feedback strategies to enhance self-regulation and accuracy in writing tasks.
3. Targeted Error Correction: Focus on the most frequent error types identified (misformation and omission), providing explicit explanations and practice exercises to reduce L1 interference.
4. Use Technology: Incorporate tools such as automated writing evaluation systems to provide immediate feedback and supplement classroom instruction.

For Curriculum Developers

1. Align English Instruction with Vocational Needs: Integrate writing tasks that reflect real-world vocational contexts, such as reports, emails, and technical documentation, to make writing practice meaningful and relevant.
2. Bilingual Program Enhancement: Develop clear guidelines and resources for bilingual instruction that support both language development and content mastery.

For Future Researchers

1. Conduct longitudinal studies to track writing development over multiple grades or semesters in vocational bilingual schools.
2. Investigate the effectiveness of specific instructional interventions, such as scaffolded writing, strategy-based learning, or technology-assisted feedback.
3. Explore student motivation and self-efficacy in writing, examining how affective factors interact with linguistic and cognitive challenges.

Final Remarks

The present study contributes to understanding writing proficiency in bilingual vocational contexts, highlighting the interplay between L1 influence, bilingual instruction, error patterns, and pedagogical practices. By identifying key challenges and proposing targeted strategies, the research provides practical insights for teachers, curriculum developers, and researchers aiming to enhance English writing skills among vocational learners. Addressing these challenges is crucial for both academic success and professional readiness in a globalized workplace.

REFERENCES

Alawiyah, N. (2024). *Bilingual education challenges and strategies in an Indonesian natural school*. <https://scispace.com/pdf/bilingual-education-challenges-and-strategies-in-an-212ly5tm8s.pdf>

Barus, I. R. G. (2025). Beyond the code: Vocational students' perceptions of project-based English writing tasks. *JESSCOM*. <https://jesscom.upnjatim.ac.id/index.php/jesscom/article/view/12>

Casinto, C. D. (2023). Scaffolded peer feedback and second language writing proficiency. *TESL-EJ*. <https://www.tesl-ej.org/pdf/ej104/a8.pdf>

Chuquin, E. G. P. (2025). Linguistic challenges and English writing proficiency. *JEELS*. <https://jurnalfaktarbiyah.iainkediri.ac.id/index.php/jeels/article/view/4423>

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Hoerudin, C. W. (2024). Optimizing bilingual teaching in developing English language skills. *International Journal of Science and Society*, 6(3). <https://ijsoc.goacademica.com/index.php/ijsoc/article/download/1248/1064/>

Marlina, M. (2024). Tailored approaches to foster EFL learners' writing proficiency in vocational contexts. *Journal of Educational Studies*.

Rihatmi, R. (2025). English learning outcomes based on Indonesian enacted curriculum in vocational education. *Al-Ishlah Journal*. <https://journal.staihubbulwathan.id/index.php/alishlah/article/download/6056/2703>

Wei, P., et al. (2023). The impact of automated writing evaluation on second language writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1249991/full>

Yuliana, F. (2024). Enhancing student English writing skills in vocational contexts. *ERJEE*. <https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE/article/download/8833/4083>

Zhu, J., Yang, Y., & Yan, Z. (2024). Relationships between teacher feedback and English writing proficiency: The mediating effect of writing self-regulated learning strategies. *System*, 123, 103338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103338>