

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Background of the Study

Evaluation is large and complex. It is an essential division of a curriculum that functions to sight the progress and achievement of students and teaching program. A good curriculum must contain a good evaluation. Without a good evaluation, a success of good teaching program that has been well-planned in a curriculum is impossible to be measured. Thus, Indonesian Government, through UU (decree) No. 2 year 2003 and *Peraturan Pemerintah (PP) No. 19 year 2005* about National Standard of Education, point 18, advocates the importance of standard evaluation inserted in educational curriculum in higher education to guarantee the competence and the quality of graduates.

However, this expectation is contrary with the fact that the number of fresh graduates of university in Indonesia who are unemployed is still high. The data show that the number of graduates that gets jobs after study completion within university is still in small percentage of all graduates, around 10, 7%. On the other hand, the number of workforce in Indonesia is approximately 21, 1 million and around 4, 1 million are unemployed. And about 89, 3 % of the number of all graduates is included in the 4, 1 million unemployed. (www.jawapos.co.id).

This reality is close related to the quality of university graduates in Indonesia, which is considered very low. This statement was stated by Sardjunani,

a deputy of human resource of *Bappenas* (National Development Planning Board), in *Jawa Pos* daily newspaper. This statement is also supported by Purwanto (2001: 22) who claims that the evaluation practice in university is still carried out inappropriately.

Evaluation consists of assembling, presenting, analyzing, and interpreting (Sharma, 2008). Assembling deals with collecting the data or information about students' achievement through some tests. After the data gathered, they are presented quantitatively and then measured and evaluated based on certain criteria.

The application of evaluation in school and university is still done inappropriately (Purwanto, 2001: 22). He indicates that some teachers and lecturers have not followed the procedures of evaluation well. However, he does not precisely explain whether the good procedures he mentioned is the process of evaluation and what parts of procedures that are not followed. Purwanto's claim over the malpractice of evaluation, if I may term the inappropriateness of evaluation with malpractice, can be proved. Through preliminary research over lecturers who teach in some private universities, it is found that the most of lecturers who are interviewed show the lack of knowledge about evaluation, especially the process of evaluation.

Evaluation in university is conducted by lecturers. they are given an full authority to create and apply the teaching evaluation in his field of studies. That is to say that different lecturers are different methods of evaluation. Some lecturers use formal tests, while others use non-formal tests. The methods they use are

based on the objectives of their teaching program. Therefore, a lecturer should show his professionalism through a strong commitment to practice teaching and evaluation activities appropriately.

In evaluation practice in university, the amount of data or information of student's performance is acquired in order to make an interpretation. The data are obtained through some tests that are administered from the beginning until the end of the teaching program. The tests are termed as formative and summative tests. Theoretically, formative is used to detect hindrances or problems of teaching and learning process. On the other hand, summative is used to assess students' learning achievement. Practically, however, the two terms can be used differently. Some institutions, such as State University of Medan, use formative term for student's learning achievement. The formative is conducted four times in a semester, which is 16 sessions. The formative one (NF1) might be conducted after four sessions of teaching program. The formative two (NF2) and formative three (NF3) might be carried out in the eighth and twelfth sessions respectively. The last formative (NF4) is taken in the last session. Then, the accumulation of the scores is divided by four and the result is the final score. Other universities, such as US XII Medan, use different terms. The University of Sisingamangaraja XII Medan uses *Ujian Tengah Semester* (UTS) (mid examination) and *Ujian Akhir Semester* (UAS) (final examination). The mid examination is carried out in the middle of the teaching program, after 7th or 8th session out of 16 sessions, meanwhile final examination is done in the end of teaching program, in the sixteenth session. The mid and final examinations are categorized as a summative

test, to assess student's learning achievement. The criteria of evaluation in US XII Medan are probably different compared to that of other universities. Students' learning achievement as a final result is the accumulation of scores of mid test (35%), final test (45 %), assignment (20 %) and student's attendance in class is not less than 70 % out of 16 sessions.

In evaluation practice, there are some issues occur dealing with ethical in assessment, instrument effect, investigating topic knowledge, investigating response bias, and investigating evaluator bias. In ethical issue Hamp-Lyons (1998) exposed the ethical implication of test preparation practice in relation to TOEFL, a wide test that is widely used by academic institutions to admit or exclude students for whom English is a second language. In relation with instrument issue, Chen and Hung reveal their findings . Chen (2006), a professor, from Indiana University exposed his findings of research conducted in Taiwan that shows the choice of instrument in evaluation can influence the student's learning results. Moreover, Hung (2009) revealed his findings that evaluation in term of method and instrument really influence students' learning interest. That is to say that evaluation method and evaluation application influence students' learning interest and learning results.

In term of topic knowledge, Reid in Allison(1999) reports research to suggest that different topic types affect writing assessment outcomes. Regarding with response bias, there is widely reported tendency of questionnaire respondents and interviewees to provide their answers. Potential responses bias also takes the

effect of giving similar responses to particular sets of items (sometimes called “halo effect”) (Allison, 1999:215).

The issue of evaluator bias is also considered not less important than other issues mentioned previously. The position of an evaluator may be quite detached from particular teaching operation, as in the case of external evaluations where the evaluator has not been involved in the development of the program. Even then, yet, the evaluator’s position will still reflect particular sets of beliefs, standards and practices that the evaluator has to make explicit in a full report (Allison, 1999: 216).

When discussing evaluation, most researchers and teachers concerns with methods, instrument, development of evaluation. Only few pay attention to the teachers or lecturers’ behaviors when carrying out evaluation in classroom. Accordingly, this study attempts to sight the process of evaluation conducted by the lecturers in university, in this case, University of Sisingamangaraja XII Medan, in English Department. There are four subjects related to English skills taught in UX II, namely listening comprehension , speaking, reading comprehension, and writing. Every subject is taught by one lecturer. He must handle his subject, for instance reading comprehension, in semester one until semester four. Thus, the subject he teaches is termed “Reading Comprehension I, II, III, and IV”. Since this is a case study, the focus of the study is on reading comprehension. The choice is based on the consideration of the researcher’s interest in reading comprehension and the sufficient data in the field.

1.2. Problems of the Study

Based on the explanation above, therefore, the problems of the study are formulized as follows:

- How does the reading lecturer evaluate reading comprehension in English Department of US XII Mean?
- Why does the reading lecturer evaluate reading comprehension in the way she does?

1.3. The Objectives of the Study

In relation to the problems of the study mentioned above, the objectives of the study are supposed to answer the problems. Therefore, the objectives are stated as follow:

- To find out how the reading lecturer evaluates reading comprehension in English Department of US XII Mean
- To find out the reasons of the reading lecturer evaluates reading comprehension in the way she does

1.4. The Scope of the Study

The study is limited to the evaluation in assessing students' reading achievement in English Department of US XII by the reading lecturer. The study focuses on how the lecturer carries out evaluation in terms of measuring, scoring, and evaluating or interpreting. In measuring, the study focuses on the test made by the lecturer, whether the test is valid and reliable. In scoring, the focus is on how

the lecturer scores the reading comprehension test. And in evaluation or interpretation, the focus is on how the lecturer interprets the scores into meaningful grades. The limitation is based on the consideration of the researcher's interest in reading comprehension and the insufficient data in the field

1.5. Significance of the Study

The study is considered significant, if it can provide scientific information, which is theoretically and practically applicable to the development of evaluation in English. It attempts to expose the evaluation of reading comprehension and the findings will be valuable for theoretical contribution on the extent of evaluation.

In practical use, the findings will be useful for those who are interested and involved in evaluation, such as researchers and practitioners. For researchers, it will give new horizon and perspectives about evaluation that might be used as a basis of their further research on evaluation. For practitioners, lecturers and teachers who are always involved in teaching evaluation, the study will contribute to their knowledge and skills improvement within evaluation.

