

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

In this chapter the writer presents the conclusion and suggestions dealing with the result of data analysis as have been discussed in chapter four.

5.1 Conclusion

In this research the writer analyzed the item analysis on the multiple choice test items of English summative test for the eleventh grade students of SMAN 7 Kupang. First, the writer was so curious whether this test really had the balance degree of index difficulty, discrimination power and distribution of distractors such easy, moderate, and difficult items. Then the writer analysed this test using the quantitative method by collecting students' answer sheet and analyzed it. Finally, the writer found out that:

1. The quality of multiple choice test items of English summative test for the eleventh grade students of SMAN 7 Kupang are good in terms of the difficulty level, discrimination power, and the effectiveness of distractors, because:
 - 1.1. Based on the difficulty level, the number of multiple choice questions categorized as easy test items was 3 items (6%), the items are numbers 4, 8, 47. There were 31 (62%) items categorized as moderate, namely item numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, and 46. There are 16 items (32%) which are categorized as difficult items, namely item

numbers 11, 12, 15, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 37, 38, 42, 43, 48, 49, and 50.

- 1.2. Based on the discrimination power, the number of multiple choice questions which have poor discrimination power was 12 items (10%). Those items are item numbers 1, 6, 15, 37, 38, and 49. Number of items with satisfactory discrimination power is 9 (18%) multiple choice questions. Those are item numbers 7, 8, 12, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, and 46. There are 24 (48%) items which have good discrimination power. Those are item numbers 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, and 47. There are 3 (6%) items which have excellent discrimination power. Those are item numbers 14, 17, and 22. In addition, there are 5 (10%) items that have negative discrimination power. Those items are numbers 11, 21, 26, 27, 48, and 50.
- 1.3. Based on the distribution of distractors, there were 22 items (44%) that have very good distractors. Those are item numbers 6, 7, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, and 49. There were 18 items (36%) that have good distractors, those 18 items included 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 13, 16, 17, 26, 27, 33, 37, 43, 44, 45, 48, and 50. There were 5 items (10%) that have moderate functioning distractors. Those are item numbers 10, 19, 21, 23, and 39. There are 5 of multiple choice items (10%) which have less good distractors. Those are item numbers 4, 8, 31, 46, and 47.

2. The multiple choice test items of English summative test for the eleventh grade students of SMAN 7 Kupangare worth to be tested with some improvements in terms of difficulty level and the effectiveness of distractors.

5.2 Suggestion

The writer would like to give some suggestions addressed to the test makers or teachers as a feedback of the research results:

1. The teachers should construct more various items in terms of the aspect that want to be tested, based on the material which is taught to the students.
2. The teacher should construct different test items for each program
3. The teacher should analyze the test that has been tested to the students by analyzing the answer sheet of the students to know whether the test is good or not to be used for the next exam.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amelia, Rika. 2010. "An Analysis of the English Summative Test Items in Terms of Difficulty Level" (Thesis). Jakarta.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi, Prof. Dr. 2013. *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Bachman, Lyle F. 2004. *Statistical Analyses for Language Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, James D. 1996. *Testing in Language Program*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Burton, Steven J, et al. 1991. How to Prepare Better Multiple-Choice Test Items: Guidelines for University Faculty. Brigham Young University Testing Services and the Department of Instructional Sciences.
- Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European Framework for Languages: Learning, Teaching, and Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DiBattista, David & Kurzawa, Laura. 2011. Examination of the Quality of Multiple-Choice on Classroom Tests. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*.
- Djiwandono, Soenardi M. Prof. Dr. 2008. *Tes Bahasa: Pegangan Bagi Pengajar Bahasa*. Jakarta: PT Indeks.
- Ebel, Robert L & Frisbie, David A. 1991. *Essentials of Educational Measurement (5th ed.)*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Erom, Kletus. 2015. *Practical Guidelines for Writing Research Report*. Kupang: Widya Mandira Catholic University.
- Gonzalez, Antonio B. 1996. Testing English as a Foreign Language: An Overview and some Methodological Considerations. *Universidad de Jaén*.
- Gronlund, Norman E. 2003. *Assessment of Student Achievement(7th ed.)*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc
- Heaton, J.B. 1988. *Writing English Language Test*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Hendra, A.A.G. 2014. "Using Multiple Choice Test Item to Assess the Reading Comprehension of Seventh Grade Students of SMPN 2 Tampaksiring in

- Academic Year 2013/2014” (Thesis). Denpasar: Mahasaraswati Denpasar University.
- Henning, Grant. 1987. *A Guide to Language Teaching: Development, Evaluation and Research*. Wadsworth, Inc.
- Hughes, A. 2003. *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Karwati, Engkar. 2010. “The Difficulty Index of English Summative Test in SMP Negeri 1 Ciputat” (Thesis). Jakarta: State Islamic University SyarifHidayatullah.
- Kencana, DilaPuspita. 2015. “Test Item Analysis of Final Examination on Economic Subject in Grade XI IPS SMA Negeri 10 Yogyakarta Academic Year 2014/2015” (Thesis). Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University.
- Madsen, Harold T. 1983. *Techniques in testing*. England: Longman University Press.
- Nofiyanti. 2011. “An Analysis on the Content Validity of the Summative Test for the First Year Students of Junior High School: A case Study of SMP N 87 Jakarta” (Thesis). Jakarta: State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah.
- Nurliyanto, Dian. 2015. “Test Item Analysis of the Final Examination on Economics Subject in Grade XII IPS SMA NegeriBanyumas Academic Year 2014/2015” (Thesis). Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University
- Richards, Jack C & Schmidt, Richard. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (3rd ed.)*. Pearson Education.
- Salwa, Athiyah. 2012. “The Validity, Reliability, Level of Difficulty and Appropriateness of Curriculum of the English Test: A Comparative Study of the Quality of English Final Test of the First Semester Students Grade V Made by English KKG of Ministry of Education and Culture and Ministry of Religion in Semarang” (Thesis). Semarang: Diponegoro University.
- Snait, Mira L. 2013. “Item Test Analysis of Multiple-Choice Constructed by the English Teachers for Eight Grade Students at SMPN 2 Kupang” (Thesis). Kupang: Widya Mandira Catholic University.
- Sudjana, Nana. 2014. *Penilaian Hasil Proses BelajarMengajar*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya Offset.