CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Problem

In teaching and learning process, testing is an essential part of the process. According to J.B. Heaton (1975: 1):

> Both testing and teaching are so closely interrelated that it is virtually impossible to work in either field without being constantly concerned with the other. In the former case, the test is geared to the teaching that has taken place, where in the later case the teaching is often geared largely to the test.

In teaching and learning process, what the teachers have taught constitutes the corpus of what they have to test. In addition, testing provides some advantages both teachers and students. For teachers, testing acts as a feedback in order to know to what extent they have succeeded in teaching the students. For students, testing provides feedback to inform whether they have made satisfactory progress and helped them identify areas of weaknesses requiring further study or practice. Moreover, testing also provides the students with an incentive to study (Read, 1983: 13).

Concerning the importance of the role of testing for teachers and students, testing must aim at providing a true measurement in order to fulfill the students' and

teachers' needs. According to Gronlund (1982: 130), there are two most important qualities to consider in testing. Those are validity and reliability. Validity refers to what extent the results serve the particular uses for which they are intended. It means that if a test intends to measure achievement, it must measure achievement. If a test intends to measure proficiency, it must measure proficiency too. Reliability refers to the consistency of test results. A test has a high degree of reliability if a testee obtains more or less the same scores on a test which is administered twice or more without any additional teaching. Although validity is the most important one, reliability provides the consistency that makes validity possible. It means that reliability is a prerequisite for validity. A test is valid when the requirement for reliability is fulfilled.

According to J.B. Heaton (1975: 154-5), there are four kinds of validity, face validity, content validity, construct validity and empirical validity. Face validity is obtained if a test item looks right to other testers, teachers, moderators, and testees. Content validity is the extent to which a test should contain a representative sample of particular course objectives. Construct validity is the extent to which a test should be capable of measuring certain specific characteristics

in accordance with a theory of language behaviour and learning. Empirical validity is obtained as a result of comparing the results of the test with the results of some criterion measure.

J.B. Heaton (1975: 154 - 5) said that empirical validity is divided into two: predictive validity and concurrent validity. Predictive validity is obtained as a result of comparing the results of the test with the results of some criterion measure such as the subsequent performance of the testees on a certain task measured by some valid tests; or the teacher's ratings or any other such form of independent assessment given later. Concurrent validity is obtained as a result of comparing the results of the test with the results of some criterion measures such as an existing test, known or believed to be valid and given at the same time; or the teacher's ratings or any other such form of independent assessment given at the same time. Either predictive or concurrent validity is established by a correlation, that is the product moment variety.

Those statements above are also supported by Norman E. Gronlund (1982: 130-1). He says that predictive validity is about how well the test performance predicts future performance on some other valued measure called a criterion while concurrent

validity is about how well the test performance estimates present standing on some other valued measure called a criterion.

Josephine Phun (1986: 35) says that her students have had an adequate command of English vocabularies for their level and could get high scores for the vocabulary test, but they often use simple words in the composition test like "I saw this and I saw that", "I went here and there", and "Everything was nice". There are no serious grammatical errors, but the use of language is totally unadventurous and uninspiring. This influences the writing teachers to lower the scores for the writing test.

Concerning the problem above, the writer is curious to know whether this problem also happens in our English Department. In other words, the writer wants to know to what extent the vocabulary test estimates someone's communicative proficiency as reflected in the performance on the writing test. David P. Harris (1969: 68-73) says that effective written expression depends on the writer's lexical resources (vocabularies) and the ability to write a foreign language presupposes a knowledge of the lexical units of the language (Valette, 1977: 223).

1.2. Statements of the Problems

The major problem of the study is : Is there a concurrent validity between Vocabulary II and Writing I achievement test ?

In order to answer this problem more easily, the problem is broken down into the minor problems :

1. Is there a positive significant correlation between Vocabulary II and Writing I achievement test ?

2. To what extent do the actual scores of Writing I differ from the estimated scores ?

3. Is the independent variable (Vocabulary II) significant in playing a role in estimating the students' dependent variable (Writing I) ?

1.3. The Objective of the Study

The major purpose of this study is to find out whether there is a concurrent validity between Vocabulary II and Writing I achievement test.

In addition, the minor purposes of this study are:

1. To find out whether there is a positive significant correlation between Vocabulary II and Writing I achievement test.

2. To what extent the actual scores of Writing I differ from the estimated scores.

3. To know whether the independent variable (Vocabulary

II) is significant in playing a role in estimating the students' dependent variable (Writing I).

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study is expected to give contributions to the teaching of vocabulary and writing at the English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya. It is a useful check to know how many students do either better or more poorly than they might have been expected to do in view of their writing ability. It is also useful to know whether the testing of vocabulary has potential as an estimate instrument of students' communicative proficiency as reflected in their performance on a writing test. In addition, it is also an input whether the vocabulary testing has potential as a predictive instrument. Norman E. Gronlund (1982: 133) says that:

> If a test provides an unsatisfactory estimate of current performance, it certainly cannot be expected to predict future performance on the same measure. On the other hand, a satisfactory estimate of present performance would indicate that the test may be useful (but less accurate) in predicting future performance as well.

1.5. Scope and Limitation

In this study, the writer limits her study to the scores of second semester students' writing and vocabulary. The writer chooses the second semester

students because the vocabulary lessons are given in the first and second semester while writing is given starting from second semester. If she chooses first semester students, the data for writing is not available yet. Based on that reason, the writer considers that second semester students are the most possible data that she could get. Besides, the writer chooses only the second semester students, not the students from the higher semester who still take vocabulary and writing, with the consideration that the students have had a lot of knowledge from other subjects. This can make the data bias; that's why, the writer doesn't include those students as the subjects of her study. In addition, she regards that the second semester students have had an adequate command of vocabulary concerning that they have had a vocabulary lesson since the first semester.

The writer chooses the S1-not D3-students with the consideration that the number of S1 students are more than D3 students so that she can get better spread of the scores.

1.6. Assumption

This study is based on the assumptions:

1.6.1. The test is done under a controlled situation so the students being tested are assumed to do the

test by themselves.

1.6.2. The teachers who teach writing and vocabulary are considered to be qualified in their field.

1.7. Theoretical Framework

The main theory underlying this study is the theory of concurrent validity. However, it is supported by the theory of testing, the theory of vocabulary, the theory of writing, the relationship between vocabulary and writing, and the last the theory of correlation.

A good test has some criteria and one of the criteria is that a good test should have validity. One of the kinds of validity is concurrent validity. In order to get the concurrent validity of a test, there must be a correlation between the predicting variable and the predicted variable. Therefore, the correlation and regression theory will state the use of statistical analysis in correlating both of the two tests.

1.8. Hypothesis

The hypothesis in this study are formulated as follows:

1. The Alternative Hypothesis (HA):

There is a positive significant correlation between Vocabulary II and Writing I achievement test of the

second semester students.

In order to test the Alternative Hypothesis, the writer formulates the Null Hypothesis (HO).

The Null Hypothesis (HO):

There is no positive significant correlation between Vocabulary II and Writing I achievement test of the second semester students.

2. The Alternative Hypothesis (HA):

There is a positive significant correlation between Vocabulary II scores and the estimated Writing I scores of the second semester students.

In order to test the Alternative Hypothesis, the writer formulates the Null Hypothesis (HO).

The Null Hypothesis (HO):

There is no positive significant correlation between Vocabulary II scores and the estimated Writing I scores of the second semester students.

1.9. Definition of Key Terms

This study uses several key terms which are necessary to be discussed further. There are concurrent validity, correlation and regression analysis.

Concurrent Validity. It is concerned with the use of test performance to estimate current performance on some criterion (Norman E. Gronlund, 1982: 133).

Correlation. According to Elizabeth Ingram (1977:22), correlation is a simple figure which expresses how much two series of numerical observations have in common.

Regression Analysis. It is an analysis in making use of a score of an individual on one variable as a means of determining or estimating a score of the same individual on another variable (Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, 1969: 190).

1.10. The Organization of the Study

This study consists of five chapters. Chapter I is the Introduction which is divided into ten sub topics: Background of the Problem, Statements of the Problems, The Objectives of the Study, Significance of the Study, Scope and Limitation, Assumption, Theoretical Framework, Hypothesis, Definition of Key Terms and the Organization of the Study. Chapter II deals with Review of Related Literature which presents the basic theories of the study and the related studies. Chapter III is the Research Methodology which is divided into five sub topics: Research Design, Population and Sample, Research Instrument, Procedure of Collecting the Data and Data Analysis Technique. Chapter IV is Analysis of the Data and Chapter V is Conclusion.