

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the Study

In education, the teaching and learning process is ideally evaluated throughout the instruction. This evaluation is defined as assessment. According to Gronlund (as cited in Kusumawati and Hadi, 2018), assessment refers to a systematic process to determine which instructional goals are already achieved by students. Anandan (2015) adds more definition to assessment by stating that assessment refers to various methods used by educators to not only evaluate, but also measure, and document the students' academic readiness, learning progress, and skill acquisition. Thus, assessment can be defined as a process of evaluating the students' progress throughout the learning process by gathering the information needed through various methods.

Assessment is divided into two types based on the function. They are formative assessment and summative assessment. According to Brown (2004), formative assessment is used to evaluate the students' progress in the process of forming their competencies with the goal of helping them to continue the growth process. Most of the classroom assessment is formative assessment since it is used as a process of learning, not as the final score. The form of formative assessment's instruments can be direct questions by teachers and quizzes. Summative assessment, on the other hand, aims to measure what the students have grasped after a series of learning process

(Brown, 2004). Thus it is typically conducted at the end of a series instruction, which can be in form of middle test and final test.

These functions make the existence of assessment very crucial. Assessment is required to promote learning and ultimately achievement, and for that reason assessment becomes fundamental in educational process (Jones, 2005). Further, Jabbaarifar (2009) states that assessment can motivate the students to study, measure their improvement throughout the learning process, evaluate the teaching strategies and methods, and rank the students based on their achievement. Thus, the result of assessment could help improving both the teachers in terms of teaching strategies and methods and the students in terms of grade. These results will be extremely valuable to improve the next teaching and learning process.

Regarding the significant roles of assessment in educational system, Indonesia government through the Ministry of Education and Culture has established an act regulating the process of assessment in Indonesia's educational system. The Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation No. 23/2016 is used as the reference for assessment standard in 2013 curriculum, the current curriculum used in Indonesia. The act regulates on article 9 paragraph 1 and item (c) that there are three aspects that must be assessed. They are attitude, knowledge, and skill. It is stated that the knowledge aspect can be assessed through three procedures, which are written test, oral test, and assignment based on the competency that want to be achieved. In regards to this regulation, the teachers surely can test the students' knowledge through written test and use it as summative assessment for middle test and final test.

One of the instruments for written test that is commonly used in Indonesia to assess the students' knowledge is multiple-choice test (MCT). It is even used as the instrument for summative assessment because of numerous benefits. Zimmaro (2016) suggests that it is very useful to measure the students' knowledge outcomes, which is in line with what is stated in the regulation. The use of MCT is also very effective since it requires less time in the preparation and the implementation (Adeel, 2005), which could be very beneficial for overloaded teachers. Öztürk (as cited in Toksöz & Ertunç, 2017) argues that MCT seems to be more reliable compared to other types of tests that can be negatively subjective. This is supported by Tsagari (1994) who finds that MCTs are less discriminating than free responses tasks. In addition, Brown (2004) states that the scoring and grading in MCT are easy and consistent. Therefore, it is not strange if MCT has been used for many years by teachers in Indonesia.

The advantage of MCT makes it used highly as middle test, final test, and even national examination in Indonesia. Every subject is graded using it, including English that is learnt as a foreign language. According to Toksöz & Ertunç (2017), MCT can help assessing the four competencies of English that are needed to be mastered by the students. The students' reading competency can be assessed by the texts provided in MCT. MCT can also evaluate the students writing skill in grammar by providing related questions, just like what is provided in TOEFL test. Even in listening, MCT is found to be easier than free

responses tests (Cheng, 2004). Even though speaking skill cannot be directly assessed, MCT could provide questions to test the students' communicative competence by assigning them to choose the most appropriate responses of certain statements or questions (Toksöz & Ertunç, 2017).

Since it is used as summative assessment, the MCT should be high in quality. As stated by Anderson and Morgan (in Fiktorius, 2014), the quality of any assessments in any educational settings is the result of the quality of the instrument used as the basis for decision making. It is because at the end of the day, the result of the instrument will take the higher percentage in the decision making of a summative assessment. Therefore, the construction of the MCT must follow certain standards in order to achieve the high quality.

Burton *et al.*, (1991) suggest that the quality of an MCT can be seen from the norms that are used in constructing it. Haladyna (2004) supports the statement by stating that there must be a set of norms that are used as the guideline in developing the MCT. The norms are used to make the MCT becomes relevant to the competencies that want to be achieve and easy to be read by the students as the test-takers. It is because when taking the MCT, the students need to answer the test to their best knowledge while dealing with the allotted time. Thus, making the test more readable is essential. Moreover, Hall and Marshall (2013) argue that the norms become important as writing a good MCT requires skill, experience, and attention to detail. Therefore, writing the MCT

with the reference to certain guidelines or norms is essentially important.

Further, to support the importance of MCT's writing guidelines, Haladyna (2004), Hall and Marshall (2013), and *Puspendik Kemendikbud* (2019) provide the list of norms in making a good MCT. Haladyna (2004)

suggests that there are 31 norms with 4 dimensions, including content guidelines, style and format concerns, writing stems, and writing options. Hall and Marshall (2013) suggest a total of 12 norms, while *Puspendik Kemendikbud* (2019) suggests 16 norms with 3 dimensions, including the material, the construction, and the language. These theories show that the norms are very essential in constructing a good MCT.

Even *Puspendik Kemendikbud* (2019) as the center of educational assessment in Indonesia suggests that when the MCT's items are not in line with the norms, then the tests are considered low in quality. Therefore, every MCT especially those who are made and implemented in Indonesia are expected to follow the norms in making a good MCT in order to maintain the quality.

SMP Laboratorim Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha or known as SMP Lab Undiksha is one of the private junior high schools in Buleleng regency, Indonesia that uses teacher-made MCTs as summative assessment for middle test. The students' English achievement in SMP Lab Undiksha is considered high since it got into the top ten of junior

high schools with the highest average national examination score in Buleleng regency straightly in a row for the past 2016/2017, 2017/2018, and 2018/2019 academic years (*Puspendik Kemendikbud*, 2019). Even in the last national examination, SMP Lab Undiksha got 66.87 score which brought it into the top ten.

The pre-observation data also showed that most of the students could pass the middle test by passing the minimum score standard for English subject in SMP Lab Undiksha, which is 70. Looking at the students' national examination score and their middle test's score, it can be concluded that the students in SMP Lab Undiksha has high achievement. It is because they could pass the national examination standard that has been a final national summative assessment for the students in their last educational stage year.

Besides indicating students' high achievement, the national examination scores also indicate that SMP Lab Undiksha have conducted good assessment practice. It is because Black and William (1998a) state that a good assessment implementation results good mastery of materials that has been taught, which can further help students for other achievement tests related to the materials. Since the students' English achievement is good, the teachers are expected to have performed good assessment practice in which the tests used in their school's assessment reflected the basic competencies that appeared in the national examination.

The teachers in SMP Lab Undiksha used one MCT for one grade,

which also shows a good assessment practice since the instrument used for measuring each student in each grade is the same. However, it is still unknown whether the teachers have followed specific norms in constructing the teacher-made MCTs to ensure the quality of the test. Considering the significant roles of the MCT as the instrument for summative assessment, a study which tries to investigate the quality of the test must be conducted.

Thus, this study tries to investigate the teacher-made MCTs that were used as summative assessment for English subject at SMP Lab Undiksha. The study investigates the quality based on the norms that are suggested by Haladyna (2004), Hall and Marshall (2013), and *Puspendik Kemendikbud* (2019) as guidelines in developing a good MCT. This study aims to investigate whether or not the teacher-made MCTs are high in quality in reference to the norms of making a good MCT.

## **1.2 Identification of the Study**

MCT is commonly used in summative assessment to assess the students' knowledge due to several advantageous reasons. For the middle test, the MCTs are constructed by the teachers of the schools. Since the role of assessing the students' knowledge is very essential, it is very important to make sure that the MCTs that were used are high in quality. The quality is seen from the suitability of the MCT with the norms of making a good MCT (Burton *et al.*, 1991; Haladyna, 2004). The pre-observation data showed that SMP Lab Undiksha already

achieved good results in the national examination which reflecting a good assessment practice by the teachers. However, the quality of the MCTs regarding the norms of making a good MCT is not yet identified. Thus, this study arises to investigate whether or not the teacher- made MCTs in SMP Lab Undiksha are high in quality based on the norms in constructing a good MCT.

### **1.3 Limitation of the Study**

In order to avoid bias discussion, the discussion is limited into two aspects. First, the study discusses the instruments for middle test which are teacher-made MCTs used for English subject for the seventh, the eighth, and the ninth grades at SMP Lab Undiksha. Second, it discusses on the quality of the teacher-made MCTs in regards to the norms in making a good MCT.

### **1.4 Statement of the Problem**

Based on the background of the study, the statement of the problem can be formulated as:

1. How is the quality of the teacher-made multiple-choice tests that were used as summative assessment for English subject at SMP Lab Undiksha?

### **1.5 Purpose of the Study**

Based on the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study can be formulated as:



1. To investigate the quality of the teacher-made multiple-choice tests that were used as summative assessment for English subject at SMP Lab Undiksha

### 1.6 Significance of the Study

The significance of the study is viewed from two perspectives. They are theoretical significance and practical significance.

1. Theoretically, this study is expected to give feedback for assessment practice in order to improve the quality of MCTs that are used as summative assessment.
2. Practically, this study is expected to give positive significance to the teachers, the stakeholders, and undergraduate students, especially those who are prospective teachers

*a. For Teachers*

The result of this study can be used as a feedback for the teacher-made MCTs that were already used. Therefore, the teacher-made MCTs in the future can be improve and have high quality by following the norms of making a good MCT.

*b. For stakeholders*

The result of this study can be used as a feedback on the standard of assessing students which could improve the school's assessment practice. The result can also be used as a base of conducting related seminars. Thus, the

teachers' knowledge in constructing a good MCT can be enhanced.

*c. For prospective teacher*

The result of this study can be used as a reference in writing related studies in assessment instrument analysis or assessment practice.

