

CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

5.1. Conclusion

If we look back into the definition of a placement test, the test should be able to help teachers decide which students should belong to certain levels of study in a program. If the test does not represent the whole skills of the whole levels of the program, it will not be able to classify the students properly based on their 'level'. As a result, some students may not belong to the proper level. They may be placed in the higher or lower level than they should be. Therefore, having a valid test will be a great advantage for a language center. A valid test should make sure that the items included are a representative sample of the content of whatever being measured by the test.

From the writer's experience in teaching students in a language course "X", he often found that students do not belong to the proper level. Since the placement of students relied very much on the placement test, the writer is interested in analyzing the content validity of the placement test of Language Center "X". The writer would like to answer the question "To what extent do the test items used for placement test at language center "X" represent the contents of the lessons?" The writer hopes that this study will be useful for the language center "X" so that they are aware of the content validity of the test and can develop the quality of the placement test.

In order to find out the content validity of the placement test, the writer analyzed the test items in details. The placement test of the language center consists of eight sections. Section 1, 4 and 5 are questions on grammar. Section 2,

3, 6 and 7 are questions on vocabulary, while section 8 is reading comprehension questions. The placement test is used to divide students into five levels of study. The writer tried to compare the test with the materials of level 1 and 2, which are the basic levels. It is mainly because the students will be placed in level 1 if they can answer up to 55% of the questions in the placement test and level 2 if they can answer correctly up to 70% of the questions in the placement test. It shows that materials of level 1 and 2 should be represented the most by the placement test.

In judging the content validity of the test, the writer converted the materials into a shortlist of materials and compared it with the placement test. The writer also asked a teacher of language center "X" and an expert of language testing as a triangulation in judging for the validity of the placement test. The writer gave them questionnaires and put the result of the questionnaire into tables and counted for the overall mean to see the degree of representativeness of the placement test.

From the data that the writer collected, he found that the placement test which is designed and applied in Language Center 'X' has very low content validity because most of the items in the placement test does not represent the materials taught in every level. He found that the degree of representativeness of the placement test towards the materials of level 1 and level 2 is very low. The mean is below 1. It means that there is only one or two items in the placement test that cover some skills of the two levels and many skills of the two levels are not represented at all in the placement test.

Moreover, the skills which are not covered by the placement test are not the minor or unimportant skills. Speaking and listening skills are important skills

which are not included in the placement test. Those two skills occur almost in every unit on each level. There are also other grammar skills like present perfect tense, present perfect continuous, past perfect continuous, articles, quantifiers, interrogative sentences, and prepositions, which are not included in the placement test.

5.2. Suggestions

Since this study deals with the content validity of the placement test of language center "X", The writer hopes that this study will help language center "X" improve the quality of the placement test.

From what has been found by the writer through this study, he recommends others who want to do similar research to analyze the validity of other placement test. Furthermore, the writer suggests that similar research is done toward TOEFL test and its significance as an English proficiency test for Indonesian students.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Alderson, J.C., K.J. Krahnke, & C.W. Stansfield. 1987. **Reviews of English Language Proficiency Tests**. Washington :TESOL
- Bachman, L.F., & A.S. Palmer. 1981. **The Construct Validation of Tests of Communicative Competence**. Washington : TESOL
- Bachman, L.F., & A.S. Palmer. 1983. **The Construct Validity of the FSI oral Interview: Issues in Language Testing**. Cambridge : Newbury House
- Brown, H.Douglas. 2004. **Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices**. New York: Pearson Education Inc.
- Brown, James Dean. 1981. **Research and Practice in Teaching English as a Second Language**. Washington : TESOL
- Brown, James Dean. 1996. **Testing in Language Program**. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents
- Davies. Alan et al. 1999. **Studies in Language Testing : Dictionary of Language Testing**. Melbourne: University of Cambridge
- Grondlund, Norman E. 1981. **Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching 4th Edition**. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.,Inc.
- Heaton, J.B. 1975. **Writing English Language Test**. London: Longman Group Limited
- Henning, G. 1987. **A guide to language testing: Development, evaluation, research**. New York: Newbury House.
- Hinofotis, F.B. 1983. **A Comparison of Factor-analytic Rotational Procedures: Issues in Language Testing**. Cambridge : Newbury House
- Hughes, Arthur. 1989. **Testing for Language Teachers**. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Nunan, D. 1992. **Research Methods in Language Learning**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Sunyoto, Lilik Dewi. 1989. **An Evaluation on the Construction of the 1988-1989 English Summative Test of the First Grade of SMA Dapena I**. UKWM: Unpublished Thesis