#### **CHAPTER I**

#### INTRODUCTION

## A. The Background of the Study

The information about students' achievement is very important in teaching and learning process. There are many tools for measuring students' achievement. One of those is a test. As stated by Hughes (2013:13) a test is intended to measure students' achievement and the degree of success of the teaching and learning program. In addition, Douglas (2004:3) says that a test, in simple terms, is a method of measuring a person's ability, knowledge, or performance in a given domain. Test is first a method. It is an instrument, a set of techniques, procedures, or items that requires performance on the part of the test-taker. Second, a test must measure. If an instrument does not specify a form of reporting measurement then the technique cannot appropriately be defined as a test. Next, a test measures an individual's ability, knowledge, or performance. Finally, a test measures a given domain. By knowing the achievement of the students, teachers can measure how many the assigned materials are mastered, how well students learn the materials, and the most important is how well students reach the stated goals or indicators and objectives.

After collecting the information about students' achievement whether it is improved or not, teachers can evaluate the techniques and mediums in teaching, and can develop the appropriate materials and assessments in teaching. Adnyayanti et. al. (2013:7) state that making a well prepared syllabus and lesson

plans is not enough because it does not automatically create a high students' achievement. Therefore, conducting evaluation to every topic discussed in the classroom is one of the most important things of teachers' tasks. This is in line with the Government Regulation number 5 in 2015 quoted from Nurfiqah (2015:2) the percentage of assessment given to the teacher is 70% and to the government is 30%. That is why teachers are demanded to be able to design a good quality test item. Moreover, Indonesian government applied the proportion for each level of education based on Bloom's Taxonomy is surely different based on the guidance for assessment which is regulated by the Ministry of Education and Culture. For Junior High School itself the proportion is remembering - understanding 20%, applying-analyzing 55%, evaluating 15%, and creating 10%.

Considering the expectations described above, there are still English test items which do not fulfill the Government Regulation. Nurfiqah, et.al found in SMAN 5 Pontianak that from 50 multiple choice of English summative test items for the first semester of Grade XI there are 4 test items which needed revisions. Based on the data shows that there are 46 items of the test which match to the indicators, and there are 4 items of the test which do not match to the indicators are should be revised. Those items is not suitable to the indicator because the indicator is about changing the sentences based on the tenses while the teacher made is about choosing a correct sentence. The indicator asks students to find the change of sentence verb which appropriate to the sentence. In that item, teacher asked directly to the students to correct the sentence but the teacher did not put the sentence that will be changed. That is why this item should be revised.

Another research finding found by Harjali at SMK PGRI 2 Ponorogo concluded that from 4 bundles of English summative tests, 20%, 15%, 33%, and 40% are rejected. Then 40%, 15%, 37%, and 35% are revised. It proves that even questions made by collaboration of some teachers nowadays cannot be guaranteed. There are still many questions which have been given do not fulfill the criteria of a good test (2012:7). Moreover, he analyzed the midterm test of SMK PGRI 2 Ponorogo in order to see whether the items were already good or not by analyzing the level of difficulty, validity, and reliability. The result of the analysis can be seen from this table below.

Table 1.1
The Analysis of Level of Difficulty English Test Items Made by Teacher

| Class | Total of the test Items |         |      |            |         |          | <b>Total</b> |
|-------|-------------------------|---------|------|------------|---------|----------|--------------|
|       | Level of Difficulty     |         |      | Conclusion |         |          |              |
|       | Difficult               | Average | Easy | Rejected   | Revised | Accepted |              |
| XI a  | 9                       | 21      | _    | 6          | 12      | 12       | 30           |
| XI b  | 5                       | 30      | 10   | 7          | 7       | 31       | 45           |
| XII a | 4                       | 18      | 8    | 10         | 11      | 9        | 30           |
| XII b | 12                      | 21      | 12   | 18         | 16      | 11       | 45           |

*Harjali* (2012)

Considering the research finding above, he said that the instrument of assessment for standard competency has been attached in lesson plan. But there are still many items which are not suitable to the indicators. This data is taken from the lesson plan made by the English teacher.

Moreover, based on the preliminary data at SMP Negeri 3 Tebing Tinggi on Thursday, 10<sup>th</sup> March 2016, it can be seen the spread of 29 (1 is error) multiple choice English questions for midterm test. From the observation which has been done, it shows that the English questions in mid-term examination which would be administered on March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2016 are mostly in remembering level. The

percentage is 76%, consist of 22 questions from 29 and almost the whole test is in this level. For the understanding and applying, the percentage is only 10% and 14%, consist of only 3 and 4 questions. Meanwhile, the three less level, analyzing, evaluating, and creating are nothing. It can be concluded that this test is totally not appropriate to be tested because it is disposed to the one level. It can be taken one example of the items at the following explanation.

Last holiday I went to Paris. I visited museums and sat in public gardens. A friendly waiter taught me a few words of French.....

What was the first place the writer visited?

- a. Museum
- b. Public garden
- c. His room
- d. Post office

It is actually is not suitable to the topic and indicators. The topic is about Oral and written text which states and asks last action/incident. The indicators are the students will be able to arrange random words to be cohesive sentence (sentence building) and the students will be able to write short and simple sentences based on context. The question above totally does not match to the indicator. Moreover, the question is only in remembering level. The question can be revised into evaluating level at the following example.

Choose the correct answer from this random sentence. Holiday- to- I- Paris- museums- visited- went- last- and-The answer is...

- a. Last Holiday I went to Paris and visited museums
- b. Last holiday went to museums and visited Paris
- c. Holiday I went to Paris and last visited museums
- d. Last I went to Paris and Holiday visited museums

From all of the errors of analyzed and explained above, the objectives of teaching and learning process do not achieved so the achievement of students cannot be measured accurately because those tests do not measure what should be measured based on the indicators which have been arranged.

Considering the facts above, it is needed to develop a good test based on the proportion of revised Bloom's taxonomy in order to get the accurate information and to develop the students' competency.

## **B.** The Problems of the Study

Based on the background of the study described above, the research problems were formulated as follows:

- 1. How are the existing English summative test items for grade VIII students at SMP Negeri 3 Tebing Tinggi arranged by the English teacher?
- 2. What are the appropriate English summative test items for grade VIII students at SMP Negeri 3 Tebing Tinggi based on the proportion of cognitive level of revised Bloom's taxonomy regulated by the Ministry of Education and Culture?

## C. The Objectives of the Study

Based on the formation of the research problems, the objectives of the study were:

 To analyze the English Summative test of Grade VIII students at SMP Negeri 3 Tebing Tinggi based on Revised Bloom's Taxonomy 3. To develop the English summative test of Grade VIII students at SMP Negeri 3 Tebing Tinggi based on the proportion of cognitive level of revised Bloom's taxonomy regulated by the Ministry of Education and Culture

## D. The Scope of the Study

In order to give the best result, this research focused on developing English summative test arranged by English teacher based on Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. There are two types of achievement test; formative test and summative test. Formative test is a test which is administered by the teacher during the learning process while summative test is a test which is administered at the end of the course covered more than one chapter or unit of materials.

The scope of this study is grade VIII English summative test arranged by the English teacher of SMP Negeri 3 Tebing Tinggi.

# E. The Significances of the Study

The significances of the study are classified into two – theoretically and practically. Theoretically is expected to add a new horizon towards the test development theories regarding to the learning objectives or indicators. Also, it is expected that the users of the theories realize the importance of understanding and applying the theories appropriately to design appropriate English summative test. Meanwhile, the practical significances of the study are as follows:

- 1. The English teachers can arrange a good test in order to evaluate the students' English acquisition based on Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.
- 2. Other researchers who are interested to conduct further research regarding to the test development

