ICOLE
International Conference on Language Education

Proceeding

4th ICOLE

4th International Conference on Language Education

Main Theme

"Curriculum and Materials Development in Language Education"

ISBN 978-602-96004-3-8

4-5 DECEMBER 2015

State University of Makassar
Kampus UNM Gunungsari Baru
Jl. A. P. Pettarani, Makassar,
South Sulawesi, Indonesia.

Secretariat: Menara Pinisi Lantai 4 Sayap C, Kampus UNM Gunungsari Baru
Jl. A. P. Pettarani Makassar, Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia, Phone +6281241670[illegible]

Scanned by CamScanner

ICOLE
International Conference on Language Education

PROCEEDING

The 4th International Conference
on Language Education 2015
(ICOLE 4)

"Curriculum and Materials Development
in Language Education".

Pinisi Tower
4 – 5 December 2015

Editor:
Masnijuri, S.Pd, MPPM

Consultants:
Prof. Dr. Baso Jabu, M.Hum
Chairil Anwar Korompot, PhD

Language Center
State University of Makassar
2015

ISBN: 978-602-96004-3-8

Scanned by CamScanner

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

Scanned by CamScanner

TEACHING TOOLS/MEDIA

Scanned by CamScanner

Scanned by CamScanner

LITERATURE

Scanned by CamScanner

The Analysis of Teacher Ability in Arranging Daily Test Assessment of Indonesian Subject

Eva Eri Dia
STKIP PGRI Jombang
evaeridia@gmail.com

Abstract

The analysis of test quality is a process which is done to determine the degree of test quality whether based on the whole test or items as the part of the test. If the test which used is not good, the result will be bad also. Basically, the test is arranged based on the principles and procedures of test arrangement. After applying the test, it needs to be known the test is good or not. To know the quality of test is good or not, it should be done the analysis of test quality.

This research describes teacher's ability in arranging assessment by analyzing the item specification which is divided into three categories namely (1) difficulty level of an item, (2) discriminating power and (3) the capacity of cuspidor.

This research used quantitative and qualitative research. The quantitative research was used to calculate (1) difficulty level of an item, (2) discriminating power and (3) the capacity of cuspidor. Whereas, the qualitative research was used to describe the analysis result toward the calculation of difficulty level of an item, discriminating power and the capacity of cuspidor.

The result of research showed the students' skill in answering the test which was influenced by the teacher's ability in arranging the item specification both of multiple choice and essay. The item formulation, providing the answer in the multiple choices can affect the level of students' skill in understanding the test, and ability for answering the test also.

Key words: Teacher ability, The analysis of items, Daily test

INTRODUCTION

The most basic problem which often be found is teachers are less of understanding the assessment well. The fact shows that teacher composed a daily test easily and carelessly. A good test needs to be composed carefully by concerning on the objectives which have been arranged in the research planning, item specification and card of item also. It is related with Djiwandono's statement (2008:201) that arranging an item test involved some processes namely: (1) The arrangement of item specification, (2) The writing of items, (3) The writing of instruction and example of answering the test, (4) The writing of key answer, or the principles of scoring, (5) The determination of test validity method, (6) Moderating pilot testing, and try-out of the test, (7) The correction of test, and (8) The arrangement of completed test items, the result of arrangement test items processes. This research was used to improve teachers in arranging the best assessment, actually in arranging the test items of multiple choices and essays. That statement is in line with Azwar's argument (2009:158-161) that the analysis of test items helps teacher in determining how far

Scanned by CamScanner

the test be useful in making decision. In the test validity, this is supposed to determine some test items which are valid to be as measurement test.

The purpose of learning evaluation is to get the proof of data which will measure how far the students can succeed reaching the learning objectives (Harjanto, 2010:277-279). Furthermore, Harjanto explains that the evaluation of teaching and learning process can use test made by the teacher which is usually called by daily test. The test made by teacher or daily test is a test which is arranged by the teacher for evaluating the successful of teaching and learning process. Usually, the test is limited for class even a school which become the applier of the test. The forms of test which is applied in teaching and learning process are (1) Oral test, (2) Written test, and (3) Attitude test. Generally, the forms of test can be divided into two types namely (1) Essay test and (2) Objective test.

To measure the successful of students' learning, teacher needs to assess through using a test whether written or orally. However, teacher often uses written test in measuring students' ability which is usually called by daily test. Written test which is usually applied by the teacher are multiple choice and essay. The teacher selects this instrument because it is easier in the application, for the most is multiple choices. The items in multiple choices become the last option for the teacher because they are easy to be corrected.

According to Purwanto (2008:118) one of way in improving teaching and learning process is by evaluating the result of test which can be gotten from the teaching and learning process. The evaluation is done by calculating the result of test to know the components which are still frail. The processing of test result can be done through these following ways namely, (1) make the items analysis, and (2) Compute the validity and reliability of test. The analysis of items has some purposes as like, (1) The answers of items are diagnostic answer for determining the subject of the class and the failure of studying also, (2) The answer of separated items and the remedial of test is based on the answers which become the basic for preparing better items for the text. The analysis of items is an activity of finding which test is good and bad, then it needs to be found the cause which causes the items are not good.

More to the point, Purwanto explains that composing items analysis should concern on: (1) measuring the difficulty level of an item, (2) discriminating power, therefore it can differentiate the students which are smart and unintelligent, (3) measuring the options of answer which are interesting or not, therefore it does not need to be tested. That statement is in line with Sudjana's opinion (2009:135) who said that the analysis of items is investigation of test questions to get items component which have good quality.

A test may not too easy or difficult. An item test which is too easy answered by the students is not good item. As well for the test which is too difficult answered is not good item also. So, a good item is an item which has certain difficulty level of an item. A test is used to separate both of students who are studying hardly and not, so a good test is a test which is totally can differentiate both of those students. Moreover, a formulation of answer option or multiple choice items (a, b, c, d and e) should be formulated carefully to know the function can be rolled well or not as the cuspidor of key answer. An option can be judged effective when it is chosen by some students. The option which is less to be chosen can be judged ineffective. (Nurkancana, 1992:155-156).

Scanned by CamScanner

In analyzing the difficulty level of an item, there are some decisions to determine the proportion of the test total which can be called easy, medium even difficult. The first decision can be used when there is balance, that is the equal test total for three of categories. It means that the test which is easy, medium even difficult have equal total (Sudjana, 2009:135). Furthermore, the analysis of the difficulty level of an item can be explained by Djiwandono (2008:218) the analysis of the difficulty level of an item is used to know how difficult or easy the test which has been given. The difficulty level of an item is determined form the comparison between the total of students who can give the best answer and the students who cannot answer the test well. The principles of decision is based on the evidence when there are many students can answer the best answer, it means that the test or item is easier.

The analysis of discriminating power is an activity which is done by investigating the items with the objectives to know the item ability in differentiating who students can be called intelligent and unintelligent. It means, when the test is given to intelligent students, the result shows high achievement while when it is given to unintelligent students, the result is frail. A test cannot be judged has discriminating power, if it is tested to intelligent students then the result is low other than it is given to unintelligent students then the result is high. Otherwise, when it is given to both of those students, the result will be similar. Thus, test which does not have discriminating power, it will not show a result which is proper with the exact ability of students. (Sudjana, 2009:141). Dealing with Sudjana, Djiwandono (2008:220) stated that discriminating power is an item analysis which considers the ability of test items to differentiate between the students which are able to answer the test well or not. A test item can be called good, when the intelligent students can answer the item well, and then the total is higher than the students who cannot answer the item well.

In analyzing the items, not only the analysis of the difficulty level of an item, and discriminating power, but also the analysis of cuspidor is needed to examine the level of a multiple choice test. The items of objective test that is multiple choices consist of main question even statement then it is followed by the number of best answer option (alternative), however other answers are cuspidors. Djiwandono (2008:225) explained that as cuspidor, those answer options have characteristics which are similar with the key answer but they are exactly false, incorrect even less correct compared with the key answer. Dealing with Djiwandono, Nurkancana (1992:162) stated that an option (cuspidor) can be called effective when the option is chosen by the number of students. Otherwise, the most option which is not chosen by the students can be judged as ineffective option.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study contains of analysis on the students' achievement of the twelfth grade of MA Darussalam Ngesong Sengon Jombang, which included 37 students, focused on Indonesian subject in the form of multiple choice including 15 items. This analysis uses the difficulty level, the discriminating power, and the capacity of cuspidor, then it is described as the result to the teachers' ability in organizing the tool of the test or can be called as instrument. Accordance with that phenomenon, this study uses qualitative and quantitative research. Determining of the research design is based on Sugiyono's statement (2010:7-8) which stated that quantitative

Scanned by CamScanner

research is working systematically, objectively, and measurable, while qualitative research is mainly focusing on the empirical data interpretation.

Collecting of the data is completed by using observation technique which conducted by verifying the item specification and the teachers' preparation in organizing the test on the item card. The other technique of collecting data is using documentation by collecting the students' achievement in daily test for determining the score, rank, and then it is composed to the framework table of item analysis.

The data analysis is administered by calculating the difficulty level, the discriminating power, and the capacity of cuspidor which is detailed as the steps following below:

1. Determining the score rank from the highest score to the lowest score
2. Preparing the framework table analysis of items, by composing table which includes the students' name and the students' score obtained.
3. Determining the upper class and the lower class by calculating with the appropriate formula:

   The upper class $= \frac{27}{100} \times$ total of the test participant

   The lower class $= \frac{27}{100} \times$ total of the test participant
4. Composing table for upper class and lower class
5. Calculating the difficulty level by using the following formula:

$$DL = \frac{WL + WH}{nL + nH} \times 100\%$$

Remarks :
WL : total of the students who answer incorrectly from the lower class
WH : total of the students who answer incorrectly from the upper class
nL : total of the lower class students
nH : total of the upper class students

6. Calculating the discrimination power by using the following formula:

$$D = \frac{B_A}{J_A} - \frac{B_B}{B_A} = P_A - P_B$$

Remarks:

J	= total of the test participant
JA	= number of the upper class participant
JB	= number of the lower class participant
BA	= number of the upper class participant who answer correctly
BB	= number of lower class participant who answer correctly
PA	= proportion of the upper class who answer correctly
PB	= proportion of the lower class who answer correctly

Scanned by CamScanner

7. Calculating the capacity of cuspidor by using the following formula:

$$IP = \frac{P}{\frac{N-B}{n-1}} X100\%$$

Remarks:
IP = The capacity of cuspidor's indices
P = total of the students who select the capacity of cuspidor
N = total of the students who follow the test
B = total of the students who answer correctly for each item
n = total of the alternative answer
1 = consistency number

8. Describing for each result of the difficulty level, the discriminating power, and the capacity of the cuspidor analysis by referring to the indicator which is adopted from Arikunto (2011: 74) as the following below:
   a. The difficulty level
      Item with P 0,001 to 0,30 is difficult
      Item with P 0,30 to 0,70 is middle
      Item with P 0,07 to 1,00 is easy
   b. The discriminating power
      D: 0,00 ---0,20 : poor
      D: 0,20 --- 0,40 : satisfactory
      D: 0,40 --- 0,70 : good
      D: 0,70 ---1,00: excellent
      D: negative, all items are poor, thus all items which have D value should be deleted.
   c. The capacity of cuspidor
      Excellent IP = 76% - 125 %
      Good IP = 51 % - 75% or 126% - 150%
      Poor IP = 0% - 25% or 151% - 200%
      Very poor IP = up to 200%

The Analysis of the Difficulty Leveli in Daily Test Items of Indonesian Subject

The difficulty level analysis is completed for investigating the students' ability in answering the item. The students' distribution to the upper and lower class is needed to investigate how difficult item for them is. The students' ability which included in the upper class and answer correctly determines the criterion of the item is proper or not. Based on the calculation, it is gained the result as the following below: (it is represented as the following table below)

Scanned by CamScanner

Tabel 1 The result of the difficulty level computation

Number of item	Result	Category
1	0,78	Easy
2	0,86	Easy
3	0,78	Easy
4	0,81	Easy
5	0,48	Middle
6	0,72	Easy
7	0,62	Middle
8	0,45	Middle
9	0,81	Easy
10	0,54	Middle
11	0,59	Middle
12	0,89	Middle
13	0,62	Middle
14	0,86	Easy
15	0,18	Difficult

According to the table representation on the difficulty level computation above, it can be described that there are 8 items which included in easy category, 6 items in middle category, and 1 item in difficult category. The items for number 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 12 and 14 are included in easy criteria since the students of the lower class able to answer correctly in high percentage. While, for the items number 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 13 are included in middle criteria since the students both the lower and the upper class are partially in answering correct and incorrect. Differ to the 15th item which has difficult category since the students both of the upper class and lower class not able to answer the item. For the upper class there are just half students who able to answer, while there is no students of the lower class who able to answer correctly. Therefore, the item number 15 is included as the item which should be revised or not proper item to be used.

THE ANALYSIS OF DISCRIMINATING POWER IN DAILY TEST ITEMS OF INDONESIAN SUBJECT

The discriminating power analysis is a computation to discover the students' ability in answering the item. In this case it is referred to the difference both of the upper and the lower students' ability in answering correctly. Based on that item computation, it can be investigated the items are functioned or not to discriminate the students who able and less able in answering. Accordance with the result in computing the daily test item of Indonesian subject, it is represented the analysis of the discriminating power as the following below:

Scanned by CamScanner

Tabel 2 The result of the discriminating power computation

Item Number	Result	Remarks
1	0,5	good
2	0	poor
3	1	good
4	1	good
5	0,3	enough
6	0	poor
7	0,4	enough
8	0,3	Poor
9	0	Poor
10	0,6	Good
11	0,6	Good
12	0,2	Poor
13	0,7	good
14	0,2	Poor
15	0,2	poor

According to the data analysis which is completed to the daily test item of Indonesian subject, intended for good category there are 6 items. The items numbers which have good category are 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, and 13. Those items have good category since the answer proportion of the upper class is higher in answering correctly than the lower class. There are 10 students of the upper class who answer correctly, and there are 5 students for the lower class. It can be concluding that those items numbers are able to measure the students' ability level proportionally (based on the division of the upper and the lower class). The item number which is categorized good describes that the item is handling good role as good item in distinguishing the upper and the lower class ability. For the items which categorized enough in distinguishing the students' ability are the item number of 5 and 7. For this items numbers, the students' ability of the upper and the lower class is not equal in answering correctly. For the items numbers 5 and 7, there are 9 students of the upper class who answer correctly, while from the lower class are 5 students. It demonstrates that there are still many students of the lower class who answer correctly. Therefore, these items numbers are categorized enough but need to be improved. For the items numbers which poor category are 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, and 15. Poor category is determined based on the students' answer both of the upper and lower class. The answer of the upper class has an equal proportion with the lower class, for example number 2. On the 2nd item number from the total students in both of the upper and lower class which consisted 10, the correct answer on the upper class is equal to the correct answer of the lower class, which is 10. In this case the 2nd item demonstrates that the item is too easy to be answered by both of the upper and the lower class with equal proportion. Thus, for the item which has poor category should be revised or deleted.

Scanned by CamScanner

The Analysis of the Capacity of Cuspidor in Daily Test Items of Indonesian Subject

The computation of the capacity of cuspidor in daily test item is completed by computing each item. This analysis is completed for investigating how far each of the option works as the key answer's cuspidor. Here is represented the result of the capacity of cuspidor's analysis:

1. The capacity of cuspidor for item number 1

Quality of the cuspidor	Percentage	Option
Very poor	250 %	A
***	***	B
Poor	0 %	C
Good	150 %	D
Poor	0 %	E

Option A has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 250 %. Options C has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Options D. has good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 150 %. Options E has poord quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %.

2. The cuspidor degree for number 2

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
Very good	80 %	A
Very good	80 %	B
Very poor	240 %	C
***	***	D
poor	0 %	E

Option A has very good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 80 %. Options B has very good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 80 %. Options C has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 240 %. Options E has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %.

3. The cuspidor for number 3

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
Very poor	300 %	A
Poor	0 %	B
Adverse	50 %	C
***	***	D
Adverse	50 %	E

Scanned by CamScanner

Option A has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 300 %. Options B has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Options C has adverse quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 50 %. Options E has adverse quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 50 %.

4. The cuspidor degree for number 4

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
***	***	A
Very poor	228 %	B
Very good	114 %	C
Good	57 %	D
poor	O %	E

Option B has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 228 %. Options C has very good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 114 %. Options D has good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 57 %. Options E has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %.

5. The cuspidor degree for number 5

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
Very poor	358 %	A
Poor	0 %	B
***	***	C
Good	63 %	D
Poor	21 %	E

For item 5 options A has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 358 %. To numbers trifling items 5 options C has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. To numbers trifling items 5 options D has good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 150 %. To numbers trifling items 5 options E has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %

Scanned by CamScanner

6. The cuspidor degree for number 6

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
Very poor	240 %	A
Poor	0 %	B
***	***	C
Very good	120 %	D
Poor	0 %	E

Option A has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 240 %. Options B has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0%. Options D has very good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 120 %. Options E has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %.

7. The cuspidor degree for number 7

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
***	***	A
poor	0 %	B
Poor	28 %	C
Good	57 %	D
Very poor	314 %	E

Option B has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Option C has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Option D has good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 57 %. Options E have very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 314 %.

8. The cuspidor degree for number 8

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
***	***	A
Very good	100 %	B
Very poor	280 %	C
poor	20 %	D
Poor	0 %	E

Scanned by CamScanner

Option B has very good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 100 %. Options C has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 280 %. Options D has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 20 %. Options E has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %.

9. The cuspidor degree for number 9

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
Very poor	400 %	A
Poor	0 %	B
Good	57 %	C
poor	0 %	D
***	***	E

Option A has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 400 %. Options B has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Options C has good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 57 %. Options D has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %.

10. The cuspidor degree for number 10

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
Very poor	235 %	A
***	***	B
Poor	47 %	C
poor	0 %	D
Poor	118 %	E

Option A has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 235 %. Options C has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 47 %. Options D has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Options E has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 118 %.

Scanned by CamScanner

11. The cuspidor degree for number 11

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
Good	133 %	A
Very poor	267 %	B
***	***	C
Poor	0 %	D
Poor	0 %	E

Option A has good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 133 %. Options B has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 267 %. Options D has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Options E has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %.

12. The cuspidor degree for number 12

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
Poor	0 %	A
poor	0 %	B
poor	0%	C
Very good	100 %	D
***	***	E

Option A has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Option B has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Option C has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Option D has very good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 100 %.

13. The cuspidor degree for number 13

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
Very poor	350 %	A
Very poor	314 %	B
Poor	0%	C
***	***	D
Good	57 %	E

Scanned by CamScanner

Option A has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 350 %. Options B has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 314 %. Options C has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Options E has good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 57 %.

14. The cuspidor degree for number 14

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
Poor	0 %	A
Poor	0 %	B
Very poor	320 %	C
***	***	D
Very good	80 %	E

Option A has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Option B has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Option C has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 320 %. Options E has very good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 80 %.

15. The cuspidor degree for number 15

The distribution of participant's answer

Cuspidor quality	Presentation	Option
Poor	0 %	A
poor	0 %	B
Very poor	262 %	C
***	***	D
Good	138 %	E

Option A has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Option B has poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 0 %. Option C has very poor quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 262 %. Options E has good quality cuspidor because the presentation showed 138 %.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis the numbers item which had been done by result points out categories each problem. Based on the varieties, the numbers item which is made by teacher points out that trifling item which is included trifling one is kept or that is negated. The analyzing is provided that teacher not promiscuously arrange the numbers item to replicate day to day. To result essays that good therefore needful

Scanned by CamScanner

measuring instrument which well too. That teacher gets to usufruct that good, suppose in arrange the numbers item learns to qualify, which is via mapping collation process estimation by arranging items grille, trifling card, analyzing usufructs to replicate by use of trick accounts to increase difficulty, distinguishing energy, and the quality cuspidor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arikunto, Suharsimi, 2011, *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan (Edisi Revisi)*. Yogyakarta : PT Bumi Aksara.

Azwar, Saifuddin. 2009. *Reliabilitas dan Validitas*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Djiwandono, M. Soenardi. 2008. *Tes Bahasa. Pegangan Bagi Pengajar Bahasa*. Jakarta: PT Indeks.

Harjanto. 2010. *Perencanaan Pengajaran*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Nurkancana, Wayan dan Sunartana. 1992. *Evaluasi Hasil Belajar*. Surabaya: Usaha Nasional.

Purwanto, Ngalim. 2008. *Prinsip-Prinsip dan Teknik Evaluasi Pengajaran*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Sudjana, Nana. 2009. *Penilaian Hasil Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Sugiyono. 2010. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Scanned by CamScanner