Application of Standard Setting across All Muhammadiyah Senior High Schools Located In Bantul District

Martin Iryayo[1], Jahidatu Lis Silmi I'la Alhaq[2]

[1,2]Yogyakarta State University, Jl. Colombo No 1 Yogyakarta, Indonesia

martiniryayo@gmail.com, alhaqsilmi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research mainly aimed at Establishing and evaluating performance standards for 11th graders on English test. Within the main purpose, the focus will be put on the determination of real cut score and classification of examinees based on their level of English content mastery. The study involved descriptive research with a cross-sectional survey. The study consisted of 243 students from all nine high schools based in Bantul district, the latter were determined by using total population sampling. Documentation was the prioritized data collection method whereby each student's answer was recorded. The research was conducted on 25th May through 10th July 2017. The data were analyzedby using a statistical software called TAP so as to obtain probability for each item and the scores of participants, both are in percentages. For partial cut score determination for Bantul, Imogiri, Kasihan, Piyungan, Prelet, and Sewon high schools, were 75.5, 46, 46, 56, 61, and 74.5, respectively.The overall cut score is 58.5 whereby 167 students out of 243 were below. Hence, 11th graders from all Muhammadiyah senior high schools settled in Bantul showed low level of English lesson content mastery.

Keywords:*Standard setting, cut score, content mastery, cross-sectional survey*

1 INTRODUCTION

The standards for setting Minimum Passing Scores (MPSs), or cut-scores, on selected response assessments have been well researched.The most prevalent method for setting cut-scores on these assessments is the Angoff (1971) method, Buckendahl, C. W., Smith, R. W., Impara, J. C., &Plake, B. S. (2002). Standard setting is the methodology used to define *levels* of achievement or proficiency and the *cuts-cores* corresponding to those levels. A cut-score is simply the score that serves to classify the students whose score is below the cut-score into one level and the students whose score is at or above the cut-score into the next and higher level, Norcini, J. J. (2003). However, Educators have diverse opinions about the best ways to assess students. Some greatly value the data produced by standardized assessments. Others believe that meaningful assessment requires time to sit and speak with or observe a child. The most important criteria for selecting a method for setting standards are whether it is consistent with the purpose of the test, based on expert judgment, informed by data, supported by research, transparent, and requires due diligence. The credibility of the standard will rely largely on the nature of the standard setters and the selection of a broadly representative and knowledgeable group is essential. After the standard has been set, it is important to ensure that stakeholders view the results as credible and that the pass rates have sensible relationships with other markers of competence, Norcini, J. J. (2003). By using standard setting in this

study, the students with low and high level of English content mastery are determined for 11th graders across all Muhammadiyah senior high schools in Bantul district.

After the independence, Dutch was not chosen to be one of the foreign languages taught in schools because it was the language of the colonialist and it did not have international stature. English was chosen to be the first foreign language. High schools may also opt to teach an additional foreign language such as French, German, or Arabic. Recently, after the downfall of Soeharto regime, Chinese has gained popularity and is taught in several schools,Lie, A. (2007). There is no reason to wonder why Dutch language was not considered national or official in Indonesia because it is clear that Indonesian citizen had been oppressed by Netherland for many years.

English is taught and used as a foreign language in Indonesia. In spite of the many years of English instruction in formal schooling, the outcome has not been satisfying. Very few high school graduates are able to communicate intelligibly in English. This sense of failure in the teaching of English as a foreign language may not be exclusively Indonesian and is associated with prevailing constraints shared by several other countries where English is taught as a foreign language, Lie, A. (2007). The problem of failing in English teaching may depend on the educational system in a country; it may also be affected by the professionalism of the teachers.

The teaching of English has become increasingly important as a foreign language in Indonesia. It is the first foreign language in Indonesia. It is a compulsory subject to be taught for three years at Junior High Schools and for three years in Senior High Schools, Mattarima, K., &Hamdan, A. R. (2016). English also has been taught in Elementary Schools as an elective subject since the implementation of the 1994 Curriculum. It seems the development of English language teaching in Indonesia touches the recent English curriculum objectives. The general standard objectives of English language teaching at Senior High Schools in Indonesia are determined as follows: (1) Developing communicative competence both in oral and in written in order to reach the level of informational literacy; (2) Raising awareness of the nature of English as a foreign language in order to compete with other countries in global community; and (3) Developing comprehension of students about the relation between language and culture, Depdiknas RI. (2006).

Since its independence in 1945, Indonesia has changed its English curriculum six times using three different approaches:

Tabel 1. English Curriculum

Starting Year	Name of Curriculum	Approach
1945	Unknown	Grammar Translation
1968	Oral Approach	Audio Lingual
1975	Oral Approach	Audio Lingual
1984	Communicative Approach	Communicative
1994	Meaning-Based Curriculum	Communicative

2004	Competency-Based Curriculum	Communicative

Ironically, there are still very limited numbers of students who are able to communicate simple in English, although they have been studying English for about six years. In this context, M. Thalal (2010) stated that there are many cases happen where students' expectations do not match with the reality of learning result showing that their English proficiency is still very low or no significant English ability after many years of study. Moreover, students of foreign language education programs are considered successful if they can communicate effectively in the language (Riggenbach&Lazaraton, 1991). The parameter used to revise the English teaching program in well-design syllabus, lesson plan, and material design that the students' success or lack of success in EFL (English as Foreign Language) is judged by the accuracy of the language they produced. In order to improve the accuracy of English communicative competence based on recent English curriculum objectives, the teaching of speaking skill has become increasingly important in the English as a foreign language context, Mattarima, K., &Hamdan, A. R. (2016).

The changes of English curricula since 1975 in our country have not yet brought any significant and substantial impact upon the ELT (English Language Teaching) class success. The main question is at what point teachers as practitioners or educators and theorists or language experts consider the class implementing a particular approach successful for teaching-learning interactions will never be exclusively dependent upon a particular teaching method (see Marcellino 2005, Setiono 2004a). Ling (1999) argues that competency is supposedly to be seen more broadly in CBL as it includes many demands rather than completing a single task. As a result, different teachers and raters may usedifferent words to describe their students' competence. He further claims that assessment is always subjective and interpretative, and it may, thus, lead to biases in teachers or assessors making the judgments.

In Indonesia, most of English learners have bad motivation and have negative effects to the teachers' instructions in teaching because of misguided assumptions on the nature of English. Those assumptions are English is the most difficult language in the world, and the nonnative speakers' speech organs and ear might not match English. H. Panggabean (2007&2015) suggested that some useful activities to motivate learners to manipulate their potentials to learn English are listening to English radios and televisions, joining English speaking gatherings, taking to English native speakers, and getting access to internet.

Implementation of school based curriculum of English with student centered learning and communicative approach (Depdiknas RI, 2006) makes a new and hard challenge for English teachers, especially in Secondary Schools. In student-centered instruction, it is a must for teachers to understand their students' individual differences. One of them is language learning strategies. Language learning strategies is a must in learning English as a foreign language to actively involve students in language learning process. Language

learning strategies directly involve students to understand and gain a large measure of responsibility for their own progress, and there is considerable evidence that effective strategy use can be integrated with the lesson which is taught.

1.1 Research Questions

1.1.1 What evidences that can prove cut-score for English lesson, across all senior high schools in Bantul district, is realistic?

1.1.2 To what extent do students from the schools involved in the study do well on English test to prove their content mastery level?

2 MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study involved quantitative approach with survey method. The data were collected by using English test results for the second semester 2016/2017. The total number of students whose results were used in this research is 240, who were selected purposively, entire population sampling. All students were in grade-11 at all Muhammadiyah high schools based in Bantul district.

3 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

After analyzing the data with TAP statistical software, the probabilities to have correct answer for each item and for school was found out. The latter helped to apply the theory by Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) concerning *Standard Setting for Local Assessments,* the detail can be seen in table 2&3.

As table number 2 shows**(see page 6, Annex 1)**, the cut scores for each school were calculated and then the overall cut score for the whole district. To determine the cutscore, there were steps to pass through; finding the probability for each item, students' scores on a test, and assigning the labels corresponding to the score. According to the theory by the university said above, the items with probability more than .5 (>.5) are counted 100%, those with probability equals .5 (= .5) are counted at 50%, and then those with probability less than .5 (< .5) are counted at 25%. After counting, the researcher used ***v***for each item whose probability was more than .5, ***m*** for items whith probability equated to .5, and ***x***for items whose probability was less than .5. Therefore, the researcher used the formula detailed below:

a. Total score **v * 100%**
b. Total score **m*50%**
c. Total score **x*25%**

The researcher summed the results from a, b, c, this sum is the cut score out of 50 because the test contained 50 items with 1 score for each correct answer. Hence, the sum was multiplied by two to have the cut score out of 100. In table 3, the researcher tried to classify the students according to their score on English test.**(check in table 2 in Annex 1)**

Table 3. Level of English Content Mastery by School and All Schools in General

SCHOOL	CUT SCORE	STUDENTS
BANTUL	N > 75.5	25
	N < 75.5	84
IMOGIRI	N > 46	13
	N < 46	34
KASIHAN	N > 46	5
	N < 46	15
PIYUNGAN	N > 56	6
	N < 56	18
PLERET	N > 61	1
	N < 61	26
SEWON	N > 74.5	1
	N < 74.5	13
ALL SCHOOLS	N > 58.5	76 **(31,28%)**
	N < 58.5	167 **(68,72%)**

The table above is clear enough to show how students occupy the rooms,

above and below the partial and universal cut score. For every school the number of examinees below the cut score outweighs that of examinees above the cut score. Based on the overall cut score, the same case prevails. Coming to the schools like Imogiri and Kasihan senior high schools, the results showed that all the examinees locate in the row below the overall cut off point.

4 CONCLUSION

Generally speaking, English language is still a problem in all Muhammadiyah senior high schools. To say that there is at least one school which is making a good step for English pleasant achievement, is still a puzzle. Based on the results, the majority of students prove themselves English content low masters. For the overall cut score, all schools have big number of students below the cut score (58.5, real cut score), and the most unpleasant results appeared at two schools (Imogiri and Kasihan high schools); no student above the overall cut score.

REFERENCES

Bejar, I. I. (2008). Standard setting: What is it? Why is it important? *R&D Connections*, *7*, 1-6.

Ben-David, M. F. (2000). AMEE Guide No. 18: Standard setting in student assessment. *Medical Teacher, 22(2), 120-130.*

Buckendahl, C. W., Smith, R. W., Impara, J. C., &Plake, B. S. (2002). A comparison of Angoff and Bookmark standard setting methods. *Journal of EducationalMeasurement*, *39*(3), 253-263.

Haladyna, T. M., & Downing, S. M. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook of Test Development.* Routledge.

Norcini, J. J. (2003). Setting standards oneducationaltests. *Medical Education, 37(5), 464-469.*

Sebastianus, W. P. (2014). Measurement Error Estimation Of Cut Score OfAngoffMethod By Bootsratp Method. *In Seminar NasionaldanTemu Alumni" Peran Pendidikan dalam Pembangunan KarakterBangsa". Program PascasarjanaUniversitasNegeri Yogyakarta.*

Marcellino, M. (2015). English LanguageTeaching in Indonesia: A ContinuousChallenge in Education and CulturalDiversity. *TEFLIN Journal, 19(1), 57-69*

Musthafa, B. (2010). Teaching English to young learners in Indonesia: Essential requirements. *Journal, 4(2).*

Lie, A. (2007). Education Policy and EFL Curriculum in Indonesia: Between the Commitment to Competence and the Quest for HigherTestScores.*TEFLIN Journal, 18(1), 01-15.*

Mattarima, K., &Hamdan, A. R. (2016). The TeachingConstraints of English as a ForeignLanguage in Indonesia: the Context of SchoolBasedCurriculum. *Sosiohuman ika, 4(2).*

Riggenbach, H., &Lazaraton, A. (1991). Promoting OralCommunication skills. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language, 2, 125-136.*

Thalal, M. (2010). New InsightsIntoTeaching of English language to Indonesianstudents.*Unpublished Paper.*

Panggabean, H. (2015). Problematic Approach to English Learning and Teaching: A Case in Indonesia.*English Language Teaching, 8(3), 35.*

Annex 1: Table 2. Calculation of Cut Score

No.	ITEM	BANTUL			IMOGIRI			KASIHAN			PIYUNGAN			PLERET			SEWON		
		%	Expected Score	Sign	%	Expected Score	Sign	%	Expected Score	Sign	%	Expected Score	Sign	%	Expected Score	Sign	%	Expected Score	Sign
1	ITEM1	93.6	1	v	89.4	1	v	90	1	v	87.5	1	v	96.3	1	v	100	1	v
2	ITEM2	79.8	1	v	36.2	0	x	50	1	m	45.8	0	v	55.6	1	v	64.3	1	v
3	ITEM3	48.6	0	x	21.3	0	x	5	0	x	33.3	0	x	66.7	1	v	57.1	1	v
4	ITEM4	88.1	1	v	48.9	0	x	65	1	v	75	1	v	85.2	1	v	100	1	v
5	ITEM5	31.5	0	x	34.8	0	x	65	1	v	29.2	0	x	0	0	x	71.4	1	v
6	ITEM6	26.6	0	x	38.3	0	x	15	0	x	12.5	0	x	25.9	0	x	50	1	m
7	ITEM7	42.2	0	x	25.5	0	x	5	0	x	20.8	0	x	3.7	0	x	71.4	1	v
8	ITEM8	56	1	v	25.5	0	x	5	0	x	58.3	1	v	59.3	1	v	14.3	0	x
9	ITEM9	40.7	0	x	6.4	0	x	0	0	x	37.5	0	x	59.3	1	v	7.1	0	x
10	ITEM10	51.4	1	v	54.3	1	v	40	0	x	45.8	0	x	22.2	0	x	64.3	1	v
11	ITEM11	75.2	1	v	29.8	0	x	35	0	x	29.2	0	x	18.5	0	x	85.7	1	v
12	ITEM12	88.1	1	v	83	1	v	45	0	x	70.8	1	v	92.6	1	v	85.7	1	v
13	ITEM13	79.8	1	v	72.3	1	v	45	0	x	50	1	m	85.2	1	v	71.4	1	v
14	ITEM14	86.2	1	v	80.9	1	v	50	1	m	83.3	1	v	100	1	v	100	1	v
15	ITEM15	76.9	1	v	44.7	0	x	35	0	x	50	1	m	70.4	1	v	85.7	1	v
16	ITEM16	27.5	0	x	29.8	0	x	25	0	x	16.7	0	x	18.5	0	x	57.1	1	v
17	ITEM17	63.3	1	v	10.6	0	x	20	0	x	33.3	0	x	51.9	1	v	71.4	1	v
18	ITEM18	76.9	1	v	36.2	0	x	35	0	x	58.3	1	v	18.5	0	x	35.7	0	x
19	ITEM19	89.9	1	v	83	1	v	35	0	x	79.2	1	v	63	1	v	85.7	1	v
20	ITEM20	55	1	v	30.4	0	x	50	1	m	20.8	0	x	7.4	0	x	28.6	0	x
21	ITEM21	68.8	1	v	14.9	0	x	20	0	x	33.3	0	x	18.5	0	x	78.6	1	v
22	ITEM22	88.9	1	v	23.4	0	x	75	1	v	83.3	1	v	63	1	v	64.3	1	v

23	ITEM23	85.3	1	v	31.9	0	x	15	0	x	20.8	0	x	33.3	0	x	85.7	1	v
24	ITEM24	38.7	0	x	31.9	0	x	5	0	x	33.3	0	x	7.4	0	x	28.6	0	x
25	ITEM25	50	1	m	19.1	0	x	70	1	v	20.8	0	x	81.5	1	v	42.9	0	x
26	ITEM26	10.1	0	x	21.3	0	x	15	0	x	20.8	0	x	59.3	1	v	7.1	0	x
27	ITEM27	13.9	0	x	19.1	0	x	25	0	x	16.7	0	x	25.9	0	x	7.1	0	x
28	ITEM28	79.8	1	v	38.3	0	x	75	1	v	70.8	1	v	88.9	1	v	78.6	1	v
29	ITEM29	87.2	1	v	41.3	0	x	45	0	x	66.7	1	v	77.8	1	v	64.3	1	v
30	ITEM30	57.8	1	v	19.6	0	x	50	1	m	58.3	1	v	29.6	0	x	71.4	1	v
31	ITEM31	86.2	1	v	76.6	1	v	95	1	v	87.5	1	v	85.2	1	v	92.9	1	v
32	ITEM32	84.4	1	v	76.6	1	v	80	1	v	87.5	1	v	92.6	1	v	85.7	1	v
33	ITEM33	62.4	1	v	44.7	0	x	25	0	x	37.5	0	x	59.3	1	v	85.7	1	v
34	ITEM34	47.7	0	x	36.2	0	x	25	0	x	33.3	0	x	22.2	0	x	50	1	m
35	ITEM35	31.1	0	x	17	0	x	30	0	x	34.8	0	x	14.8	0	x	21.4	0	x
36	ITEM36	62.4	1	v	53.2	1	v	45	0	x	62.5	1	v	18.5	0	x	50	1	m
37	ITEM37	66.1	1	v	44.7	0	x	32	0	x	58.3	1	v	85.2	1	v	35.7	0	x
38	ITEM38	81.7	1	v	42.6	0	x	65	1	v	79.2	1	v	37	0	x	64.3	1	v
39	ITEM39	80.7	1	v	61.7	1	v	55	1	v	62.5	1	v	37	0	x	42.9	0	x
40	ITEM40	89	1	v	83	1	v	90	1	v	91.7	1	v	88.9	1	v	71.4	1	v
41	ITEM41	70.6	1	v	48.9	0	x	50	1	m	45.8	0	x	63	1	v	57.1	1	v
42	ITEM42	74.3	1	v	42.6	0	x	50	1	m	37.5	0	x	55.6	1	v	64.3	1	v
43	ITEM43	45	0	x	51.1	1	v	60	1	v	70.8	1	v	29.6	0	x	64.3	1	v
44	ITEM44	65.1	1	v	59.6	1	v	30	0	x	41.7	0	x	11.1	0	x	28.6	0	x
45	ITEM45	27.5	0	x	10.6	0	x	5	0	x	20.8	0	x	14.8	0	x	53.8	1	v
46	ITEM46	21.3	0	x	4.3	0	x	0	0	x	4.2	0	x	18.5	0	x	0	0	x
47	ITEM47	62.6	1	v	57.4	1	v	15	0	x	33.3	0	x	44.4	0	x	64.3	1	v
48	ITEM48	60.2	1	v	12.8	0	x	10	0	x	20.8	0	x	34.6	0	x	35.7	0	x
49	ITEM49	50	1	m	27.7	0	x	10	0	x	37.5	0	x	25.9	0	x	42.9	0	x
50	ITEM50	37.1	0	x	21.3	0	x	5	0	x	16.7	0	x	34.6	0	x	57.1	1	v

Count v	33	14	12	20	24	32
Count m	2	0	6	2	0	3
Count x	15	36	32	28	26	15
CUT SCORE	75.5	46	46	56	61	74.5
OVERALL CUT SCORE	**58.5**					