

CAKRAWALA PENDIDIKAN

**FORUM KOMUNIKASI ILMIAH
DAN EKSPRESI KREATIF
ILMU PENDIDIKAN**

Membumikan Model Lesson Study Berbasis Sekolah
dalam Upaya Mengembangkan Kompetensi Guru

To Minimize Errors in Speech Production

Teaching Listening Using Web Based Materials

Pentingnya Budaya Disiplin dalam Perkuliahan

Peningkatan Modal Sosial sebagai Solusi Cerdas Pengentasan Kemiskinan

Model Isu Kontroversial dalam Pembelajaran PKn
sebagai Solusi Meningkatkan Ketrampilan Berfikir Kritis Siswa

Effect of Emotional Quotient, Spiritual Quotient, and Quality
of Work Life of Performance

Implementasi Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Jigsaw
untuk Meningkatkan Kreatifitas dan Hasil Belajar

Memahamkan Operasi Pecahan melalui Penerapan Grup Investigasi

Analisis Kinerja Karyawan Ditinjau dari Etos Kerja
dan Motivasi Berprestasi pada Karyawan

Linguistic Aspect in HCG Ultra Users' Comments

An Analysis on the Content Validity Of National English Test
on Reading 2011 for Senior High School

Penerapan Metode The Power of Two
untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Belajar Kolaborasi

Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe STAD
untuk Meningkatkan Pemahaman Konsep Mahasiswa

Pembelajaran Matematika dengan Media Pohon Matematika
pada Materi Operasi Hitung Bilangan Bulat

CAKRAWALA PENDIDIKAN

Forum Komunikasi Ilmiah dan Ekspresi Kreatif Ilmu Pendidikan

Terbit dua kali setahun pada bulan April dan Oktober
Terbit pertama kali April 1999

Ketua Penyunting

Kadeni

Wakil Ketua Penyunting

Syaiful Rifa'i

Penyunting Pelaksana

R. Hendro Prasetianto

Udin Erawanto

Riki Suliana

Prawoto

Penyunting Ahli

Miranu Triantoro

Masruri

Karyati

Nurhadi

Pelaksana Tata Usaha

Yunus

Nandir

Sunardi

Alamat Penerbit/Redaksi: STKIP PGRI Blitar, Jalan Kalimantan No. 111 Blitar, Telepon (0342)801493. Langganan 2 nomor setahun Rp 50.000,00 ditambah ongkos kirim Rp 5.000,00. Uang langganan dapat dikirim dengan wesel ke alamat Tata Usaha.

CAKRAWALA PENDIDIKAN diterbitkan oleh Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan PGRI Blitar. **Ketua:** Dra. Hj. Karyati, M.Si, **Pembantu Ketua:** M. Khafid Irsyadi, ST, S.Pd

Penyunting menerima sumbangan tulisan yang belum pernah diterbitkan dalam media cetak lain. Syarat-syarat, format, dan aturan tata tulis artikel dapat diperiksa pada *Petunjuk bagi Penulis* di sampul belakang-dalam jurnal ini. Naskah yang masuk ditelaah oleh Penyunting dan Mitra Bestari untuk dinilai kelayakannya. Penyunting melakukan penyuntingan atau perubahan pada tulisan yang dimuat tanpa mengubah maksud isinya.

Petunjuk Penulisan Cakrawala Pendidikan

1. Naskah belum pernah diterbitkan dalam media cetak lain, diketik spasi rangkap pada kertas kuarto, panjang 10–20 halaman, dan diserahkan paling lambat 3 bulan sebelum penerbitan, dalam bentuk ketikan di atas kertas sebanyak 2 eksemplar dan pada disket komputer IBM PC atau kompatibel. Berkas naskah pada disket komputer diketik dengan menggunakan pengolah kata *Microsoft Word*.
2. Artikel yang dimuat dalam jurnal ini meliputi tulisan tentang hasil penelitian, gagasan konseptual, kajian dan aplikasi teori, tinjauan kepastakaan, dan tinjauan buku baru.
3. Semua karangan ditulis dalam bentuk *esai*, disertai judul subbab (*heading*) masing-masing bagian, kecuali bagian pendahuluan yang disajikan tanpa judul subbab. Peringkat judul subbab dinyatakan dengan jenis huruf yang berbeda, letaknya rata tepi kiri halaman, dan tidak menggunakan nomor angka, sebagai berikut.

PERINGKAT 1 (HURUF BESAR SEMUA TEBAL, RATA TEPI KIRI)

Peringkat 2 (Huruf Besar-kecil Tebal, Rata Tepi Kiri)

Peringkat 3 (Huruf Besar-kecil Tebal, Miring, Rata Tepi Kiri)

4. Artikel konseptual meliputi (a) judul, (b) nama penulis, (c) abstrak (50–75 kata), (d) kata kunci, (e) identitas penulis (tanpa gelar akademik), (f) pendahuluan yang berisi latar belakang dan tujuan atau ruang lingkup tulisan, (g) isi/pembahasan (terbagi atas sub-subjudul), (h) penutup, dan (i) daftar rujukan. Artikel hasil penelitian disajikan dengan sistematika: (a) judul, (b) nama (-nama) peneliti, (c) abstrak, (d) kata kunci, (e) identitas peneliti (tanpa gelar akademik) (f) pendahuluan berisi pembahasan kepastakaan dan tujuan penelitian, (g) metode, (h) hasil, (i) pembahasan, (j) kesimpulan dan saran, dan (k) daftar rujukan.
5. Daftar rujukan disajikan mengikuti tatacara seperti contoh berikut dan diurutkan secara alfabetis dan kronologis.

Anderson, D.W., Vault, V.D., dan Dickson, C.E. 1993. *Problems and Prospects for the Decades Ahead: Competency Based Teacher Education*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Huda, N. 1991. *Penulisan Laporan Penelitian untuk Jurnal*. Makalah disajikan dalam Lokakarya Penelitian Tingkat Dasar bagi Dosen PTN dan PTS di Malang Angkatan XIV, Pusat Penelitian IKIP MALANG, Malang, 12 Juli.

Prawoto. 1988. *Pengaruh Penginformasian Tujuan Pembelajaran dalam Modul terhadap Hasil Belajar Siswa SD PAMONG Kelas Jauh*. Tesis tidak diterbitkan. Malang: FPS IKIP MALANG.

Russel, T. 1993. An Alternative Conception: Representing Representation. Dalam P.J. Black & A. Lucas (Eds.). *Children's Informal Ideas in Science* (hlm. 62-84). London: Routledge.

Sihombing, U. 2003. *Pendataan Pendidikan Berbasis Masyarakat*. <http://www.puskur.or.id>. Diakses 21 April 2006

Zainuddin, M.H. 1999. Meningkatkan Mutu Profesi Keguruan Indonesia. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 1(1):45–52.

6. Naskah diketik dengan memperhatikan aturan tentang penggunaan tanda baca dan ejaan yang dimuat dalam *Pedoman Umum Ejaan Bahasa Indonesia yang Disempurnakan* (Depdikbud, 1987).

CAKRAWALA PENDIDIKAN
Forum Komunikasi Ilmiah dan Ekspresi Kreatif Ilmu Pendidikan

 Volume 14, Nomor 2, Oktober 2012

Daftar Isi

| | |
|---|-----|
| Membumikan Model Lesson Study Berbasis Sekolah dalam Upaya Mengembangkan Kompetensi Guru | 111 |
| <i>Ekbal Santoso</i> | |
| To Minimize Errors in Speech Production | 120 |
| <i>Feri Huda</i> | |
| Teaching Listening Using Web Based Materials | 128 |
| <i>M Ali Mulhuda</i> | |
| Pentingnya Budaya Disiplin dalam Perkuliahan | 136 |
| <i>Masruri</i> | |
| Peningkatan Modal Sosial sebagai Solusi Cerdas Pengentasan Kemiskinan | 139 |
| <i>Miranu Triantoro</i> | |
| Model Isu Kontroversial dalam Pembelajaran PKn sebagai Solusi Meningkatkan Ketrampilan Berfikir Kritis Siswa | 146 |
| <i>Udin Erawanto</i> | |
| Effect of Emotional Quotient, Spiritual Quotient, and Quality of Work Life of Performance | 155 |
| <i>Kadeni</i> | |
| Implementasi Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Jigsaw untuk Meningkatkan Kreatifitas dan Hasil Belajar | 169 |
| <i>Karyati</i> | |
| Memahami Operasi Pecahan melalui Penerapan Grup Investigasi | 177 |
| <i>Mohamad Khafid Irsyadi</i> | |
| Analisis Kinerja Karyawan Ditinjau dari Etos Kerja dan Motivasi Berprestasi pada Karyawan | 188 |
| <i>Ninik Srijani</i> | |
| Linguistic Aspect in HCG Ultra Users' Comments | 196 |
| <i>Rainerius Hendro Prasetyanto</i> | |
| An Analysis on the Content Validity Of National English Test on Reading 2011 for Senior High School. | 205 |
| <i>Saiful Rifa'i</i> | |
| Penerapan Metode The Power of Two untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Belajar Kolaborasi .. | 219 |
| <i>Sudjianto</i> | |
| Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe STAD untuk Meningkatkan Pemahaman Konsep Mahasiswa ... | 230 |
| <i>Suryanti</i> | |
| Pembelajaran Matematika dengan Media Pohon Matematika pada Materi Operasi Hitung Bilangan Bulat | 237 |
| <i>Wahid Ibnu Zaman</i> | |

AN ANALYSIS ON THE CONTENT VALIDITY OF NATIONAL ENGLISH TEST ON READING 2011 FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL.

Saiful Rifa'i

STKIP PGRI BLITAR

Email: rifai.saiful@gmail.com

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah test bacaan bahasa Inggris mencakup dan sesuai dengan materi kelas 1, kelas 2, kelas 3 dalam kurikulum KTSP. Untuk mendiskripsikan validitas isi dari bacaan bahasa Inggris untuk Ujian Nasional tingkat SMA, peneliti menerapkan metode deskriptif kuantitatif. Sumber data di ambil dari dokumen ujian Nasional bahasa Inggris paket 39, 12, 46, 25 dan paket 54. Dari hasil analisis dari lima set test bacaan bahasa Inggris English National Examination on Reading untuk Ujian Nasional, peneliti dapat menyimpulkan bahwa semua item soal memiliki validitas yang sangat tinggi, dan mencakup semua materi yang di sarankan oleh kurikulum.

Abstract: This research is aimed at Finding out whether National English Test on Reading 2011 for SMA covers and matches all materials in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd year included in the KTSP (2006) SMA Curriculum. In order to achieve the description of the content validity of English National Examination on Reading for SMA, the researcher applies a descriptive quantitative method. The source of data taken from English national examination on reading tests 2011 Package 39, Package 12, Package 46, Package 25 and Package 54 for Senior High School. From the result of analyzing the five set tests of English national examination on reading for Senior High School, the researcher concludes that all the items match the 2006 (KTSP) curriculum and it has high validity. And the items cover all materials suggested by the curriculum.

Key words: analysis, content validity, national english test on reading

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation is the process of determining the program, course, or other initiatives, toward the ultimate goal of making decisions about adopting, rejecting, or revising the innovation. Evaluation in learning is needed in the world of education. It is needed after conducting instruction in a class. Teachers regularly use tests to help diagnose students' strength and weaknesses, to access students' progress and to assist in evaluating students' achievement.

There are many kinds of tests used to measure students' achievement. One of them is standardized test. Regarding standardized test, Harris (1969:2) states: "A standardized test is a test designed to be used with thousands and sometimes hundreds of thousands of subject throughout the nation of the world, and prepared (perhaps administered, scored and interpreted) by a team of testing specialist with personal knowledge of the examinees."

Language test have many uses in educational program. One of them is to measure the extent of students' achievement of the instructional goals which is called achievement test. Harris (1969:3) state that: "achievement tests are used to indicate group or individual progress toward the instructional objectives of a specific research or training program, this includes progress test and final examination in a course of research".

The researcher thinks that there are many problems as described above, the researcher concluded that National English Test on Reading is a kind of achievement test. So it should cover more materials than a teacher – made test, because it is designed to access more than one year learning. Therefore, in this research the researcher wants to know whether or not SMA National English Test on Reading covers all materials in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd year included in the *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP)* and whether or not SMA National English Test on Reading matches the materials in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd year included in the KTSP (2006) SMA Curriculum.

This research studies the content validity of the National English Test on Reading 2011 for Senior High School. The main points of this research focus on: 1) Does National English Test on Reading 2011 for SMA cover all materials in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd year included in the SMA curriculum? 2) Does National English Test on Reading 2011 for SMA match the materials in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd year included in the SMA Curriculum? Related to the statement of the problem above, this research is aimed at: 1) Finding out whether National English Test on Reading 2011 for SMA covers all materials in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd year included in the SMA Curriculum. 2) Finding out whether National English Test on Reading 2011 for SMA matches the materials in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd year included in the SMA Curriculum.

The results of this research hopefully can give contribution both theoretically and practically for English teachers especially for teachers involved in the team of test makers of National English Test on Reading.

THEORETICAL BASIS

Types of Test

Bachman (1990:2) stated that "the test especially language test can be classified based on five distinctive features: The purposes, the content upon which they are based, the frame of reference with their result to be interpreted, the way in which they are scored, and the specific testing method used."

According to the first features, tests are classified into three groups: the first group is for admission decisions that include selection, entrance and readiness test. The second group is for identifying the appropriate instructional levels or specific areas in which instruction is needed comprising placement and despotic test. The last classification of this feature is to know how well attain the objective consisting progress, achievement, attainment and mastery test.

Moreover, test can be classified according to frame reference for score interpretation. They are norm referenced and criterion referenced test. Norm referenced test are designed to enable the test user to make normative interpretation of test results, that is, the test results are interpreted with reference to the performance of a given group or norm. While criterion referenced tests are designed to enable the test user interpret a test result with reference to a criterion level of ability or domain of content.

The next feature of test classification is based on the scoring procedure. It includes objective test and subjective test. The correctness of the test taker's response is determined entirely by determined criteria so that no judgment is required on the part of the score. In a subjective test, on the other hand, the score must make a judgment about the correctness of the response based on his subjective interpretation of the scoring criteria.

Finally, test can be classified according to the specific testing method using competence standard of reading.

Characteristic of Good Language Test

Harris (1969:12) states that "all good tests posses' three qualities: validity, reliability and practicality that is to say, any test that we use must be

appropriate in terms of our objectives, dependable in the evidence it provides and applicable to our particular situation.”

Validity

Validity is one of the important characteristics belonging to measurement. Gronlund (1982:4) proposed that “validity refers to the appropriateness of the interpretation of the test result. In the selection of any test, two questions must be considered: what precisely does the test measure? And how well does the test measure? If the test is found to be based upon a sound analysis of the skills or skills we wish to measure, and if there is sufficient evidence that test scores correlate fairly highly with actual ability in the skills area being tested, then we may feel reasonably safe in assuming that the test is valid for our purpose. A number of types of validation are applied to tests, all of them attempt to answer the above questions. There are many types of validity; they are content validity, empirical validity, and face validity.

Content Validity

The first type of validity is content validity. If a test is designed to measure mastery of a specific skill of the content of a particular course of study, we should expect the test to be based upon a careful analysis of the skill or an outline of the course, and we should further expect the items to represent adequately each portion of the analysis or outline, not just those aspects which lend themselves most readily to a particular kind of test question.

Harris (1969:19) proposed that “to the extent that the analysis accords with the views of recognized authorities in the skills area and the test then reflects such an analysis, it may be said to have content validity.”

Empirical Validity

The second type of validity is empirical validity. The best way to check on the actual effectiveness of a test is to determine how test scores are related to some independent, outside criterion such as marks given at the end of a course or

instructors’ or supervisors’ ratings. If the evidence shows that there is a high correlation between test scores and a trustworthy external criterion, we are justified in putting our confidence in the empirical validity of the test.

Empirical validity is of two general kinds, predictive and concurrent validity, depending on whether test scores are correlated with subsequent or concurrent criterion measures. For example, if we use a test of English as a second language to screen university applicants and then correlate test scores with grades made at the end of the first semester, we are attempting to determine the predictive validity of the test. On the other hand, we follow up the test immediately by having an English teacher rate each student’s English profanely on the basis of his class performance during the first week and correlate the two measures, we are seeking to establish the concurrent validity of the test.

Reliability

Harris (1969:14) states that “reliability means the stability of the test scores. A test cannot measure anything when English National Examination on unless it measure consistently.” Test reliability is affected by a number of factors, chief among them being the adequacy of the sampling of tasks. Generally speaking, the more samples of students’ performance we take, the more reliable will be our assessment of their knowledge and ability.

Score or rater reliability concern the stability or consistency with which test performances are evaluated. Scorer reliability is nearly perfect in the case of multiple choice tests, but tends to be low in case of free response test, like compositions, where a series of individual judgment must be made.

There are four types of estimates of reliability. They are test retest reliability, parallel, split-half and individual equivalence. 1) Test - retest reliability, in this approach, the same individual is given same test at different time. 2) Parallel is done by giving different version of the same test which is equivalent in length, difficulty, time limits, format and other such aspects. 3) Split - half measures reliability by giving a single administration of one form of the test and then by dividing the items into two halves usually by separating odd -

and even – numbered items. 4) Individual equivalent is the most familiar procedure being used. This method was developed by Kuder and Richardson. It concerns with inter item consistency as determined by the proportion of persons who pass and the proportion who do not pass each item.

Practicality

The third characteristic of good language test is practicality or usability. A test may be a highly reliable and valid instrument but still be beyond our means of facilities. Thus in the preparation of a new test or adoption of an existing one, we must keep in mind a number of very practical considerations.

Economy is one of the factors needed to be considered. If a standard test is used, we must take into account cost per copy, and whether or not the books are reusable. Besides, it should be determined whether several administrators and score will be needed for the more persons who must be involved in giving and scoring a test more costly the process become. Lastly, we also should pay attention to how long the administering and scoring of it will take.

Next, ease of administration and scoring is another requirement of practical test. It involves the ease with which the test can be administered. Are full, clear directions provided so that the test administrators can perform his tasks quickly and efficiently.

The last requirement is ease of interpretation. If a standard test is being adapted, it is important that we examine and take into account the data which the publisher provides. If we plan to use the test over a long period of time, we shall almost certainly develop local norm of our own. However, we need to have some general guidance as to the meaning of test scores to begin with or without this. It is extremely difficult to use an instrument in an efficient manner.

Standardized Achievement Test

Achievement testing plays an important role in education, because it describes an individual ability in a certain subject. Beside it should represent all materials suggested. Mehren and Lenman (1980:13) said that “an achievement test

must have representative sampling of relevant content (that is processes content validity) and it designed measure the extent of present knowledge and skills, regardless whether this test was constructed by classroom teacher or by professional test makers.”

There are two kinds of achievement test. First, classroom test, it is generally prepared, administered, and scored by one teacher. In this situation, test objective can be based directly on course objectives and test content derived from specific course content. In as much as instructor, test writer and evaluator are all the same individual, the students know pretty much what is expected, what is likely to be covered by the test questions and what kind of standards are likely to be applied in the scoring and the interpretation of the results.

Next, standardized test, it is designed to be used with thousands and some time hundreds of thousands of throughout the nation of the world and perhaps administered, scored and interpreted by a team of testing specialists with no personal knowledge of the examinees and no opportunity to check on the consistency of individual performances.

From the definition above it can be conducted that standardized achievement test usually has higher validity and reliability. Besides, standardized test is used to measure the student ability throughout the country; classroom test is used to measure the pupils’ ability of one school only.

SMA Curriculum of English

This part will describe KTSP (2006) SMA curriculum of English, it is elaborated in the guidelines of instructional program (competence standard). “Curriculum is the set of courses, and their content, offered at a school or university”. A curriculum is prescriptive, and is based on a more general syllabus which merely specifies what topics must be understood and to what level to achieve a particular grade or standard. A curriculum may be partly or entirely determined by an external, authoritative body.

Curriculum means two things: (i) the range of courses from which students choose what subject matters to study, and (ii) a specific learning program. In the latter case, the curriculum col-

The Grille of National English Test for SMA

| No. | Competency Standard | Graduates Indicators |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | <p>Listening</p> <p>Understanding the meaning of interpersonal and transactional formal and informal in the form of short functional text</p> <p>Recount, narrative, procedure, descriptive, news items, reports, analytical exposition, hortatory exposition, explanation, discussion, and review in the daily living context.</p> | <p>Played an oral conversation</p> <p>Interpersonal / Transactional, students can determine general / specific information / details explicit from the conversation.</p> <hr/> <p>Played an oral conversation</p> <p>Interpersonal / Transactional, students can respond / equip it with expressions of disbelief / satisfied / not satisfied / express / ask for opinions / promise / expression of hope.</p> <hr/> <p>Played an oral conversation</p> <p>Interpersonal / Transactional, students can determine the image that corresponds to the conversation.</p> <hr/> <p>Played a monologue text, students can</p> <p>Determine the images that correspond to the text.</p> <hr/> <p>Played a monologue text, students can</p> <p>Determine general / specific information / details of the text explicit.</p> |
| 2. | <p>Reading</p> <p>Understanding the meaning of the discourse of formal and informal written in the form of short functional text, <i>recount, narrative, procedure, descriptive, news items, reports, analytical exposition, hortatory exposition, explanation, discussion, and review</i> in the daily living context.</p> | <p>Presented a short functional text in the form <i>Messages</i>, students can determine a general overview / reference word / meaning of the word in the text.</p> <hr/> <p>Presented a short functional text in the form <i>Announcement</i>, students can determine general / specific information / details of the text explicit.</p> <hr/> <p>Presented a short functional text in the form <i>Advertisement / brochure</i>, students can determine a general / specific information / meaning of the word in the text.</p> <hr/> <p>Presented a short functional text in the form <i>News item</i>, students can determine a general / specific information detailed written information / meaning of the word / phrase.</p> <hr/> <p>Presented a short functional text in the form <i>Recount</i>, students can specify certain information / paragraph of the main thoughts / information implicit / meaning of words / phrases from the text.</p> <hr/> <p>Presented a short functional text in the form <i>Explanation</i>, students can determine a general / specific information / details written / communicative purpose / meaning of words / phrases from the text.</p> <hr/> <p>Presented a short functional text in the form <i>Analytical /hortatory exposition</i>, students can determine a general / specific information / paragraph of the main thoughts / information detailed explicit / implicit / meaning of words / phrases from the text.</p> <hr/> <p>Presented a short functional text in the form <i>Discussion</i>, students can determine a general / specific information / details explicit / implicit information / meaning of words / phrases from the text.</p> <hr/> <p>Presented a short functional text in the form <i>Review</i>, students can determine a general / specific information / details explicit / implicit information / meaning of words / phrases from the text.</p> |

lectively describes the teaching, learning, and assessment materials available for a given course of study.

In the guidelines of instructional program, it is stated that there are 21 units for three years, 6 units are for first year, 6 units are for the second year, and 9 units are for the third year. Each unit consists of 7 subunits or aspect; they include Reading, Speaking, Listening, Writing, Pronunciation, Grammar and Structure.

The aim of teaching reading skill is to develop the students' understanding English text. It is really needed in the era of technological progress, so the curriculum objective of English in SMA is emphasized on reading.

The teaching of expression is aimed at applying the expressing happiness, greeting, introducing, parting, etc. The teaching of structure is aimed at applying the pattern given. Therefore, the students are expected to be able to make good sentences

The grammar is focuses on the understanding and using of the structure especially in reading texts. Whenever the students get a new reading text they get new structure. In order to achieve the goals, grammar mastery should be based on the context so that the students can recognize and used the sentence appropriately.

The conversation is one of the English aspects which are aimed at developing speaking skill. The materials are about: identifying object, expressing agreement, introducing people and inviting people etc. in speaking, the students can try to use the structure given.

The writing goal is to develop the student ability in expressing their ideas through writing. In improving the materials is pronunciation of the students, take are provided such as identifying the spelling of certain words, pronouncing a letter in wood. The students are asked to make simple sentence based on the picture provided expressing their ideas using simple words, arrange given sentences into paragraph, and write paragraph by using their own words and the like .

RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter discusses about the methodology used in this research. The researcher divides this chapter into five subchapters. The first is re-

search design, the second is object of the study, the third is instrument of the study, the fourth is data analysis and the last is technique of the data analysis. In this research, the researcher applies a descriptive quantitative method. It is aimed at getting an objective description about content validity of National English Test on Reading for SMA. The content validity of the National English Test on Reading 2011 was based on the 2006 SMA. These tests were determined to be the object of the study. In getting the data of the study, the researcher used the documentation only, they are the data related to: 1) Guidelines of instructional program (Competence Standard). It consists of English instructional program that should be given in the three year learning. According to the instructional of constructing National English Test on Reading for SMA, the English National Examination on Reading should cover all materials suggested by guidelines of instructional program (Competence Standard) with the proportion as follows: a) 20 % is about the materials of the first year, 3) 30 % is about the materials of the second year, 4) 50 % is about the materials of the third year. The researcher used English tests 2011 version Package 39, Package 12, Package 46, Package 25 and Package 54 for Senior High School.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

According to the instruction of constructing the items of the National English Test on Reading, the tests should cover the materials suggested by curriculum with the proportion as follows: 20 % are the materials of the first year, 30 % are the materials of the second year and 50 % are the materials of the third year. Each set of the National English Test on Reading consists of 35 items. So, 20 % or 7 items of the National English Test on Reading should cover the materials of the first year, 30 % or 11 items of the National English Test on Reading should cover the materials of the second year, and 50 % or 17 items of the National English Test on Reading tests should cover the materials of the third year. Based on analysis, the coverage of the National English Test on Reading items to the materials suggested by curriculum are :

English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 12

| Material | No of Item | Present | Not Present | Class | Smtr | Note |
|---|------------|---------|-------------|-------|------|------|
| Message | 16-17 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| AnnoEnglish National Examination on Readingcement | 18-19 | √ | – | 2 | 1 | |
| Advertisement | 20-22 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |
| Report | 23-27 | √ | – | 2 | 1 | |
| News item | 28-31 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |
| Explanation | 32-36 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| Descriptive | 37-40 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |
| Discussion | 41-45 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| Review | 46-50 | √ | – | 3 | 2 | |

From the data analysis above the writer concluded that English National Examination on Reading 2011 package 12 has high validity because each of test item match the KTSP (2006) SMA Curriculum.

English National Examination on Reading2011 Package 25

| Material | No of Item | Present | Not Present | Class | Smt | Note |
|---|------------|---------|-------------|-------|-----|------|
| Message | 16-17 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| AnnoEnglish National Examination on Readingcement | 18-19 | √ | – | 2 | 1 | |
| Advertisement | 20-22 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |
| Explanation | 23-27 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| Discussion | 28-32 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| Report | 33-37 | √ | – | 2 | 1 | |
| News item | 38-41 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |
| Descriptive | 42-45 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |
| Review | 46-50 | √ | – | 3 | 2 | |

From the data analysis above the writer concluded that English National Examination on Reading2011 package 25 has high validity because each of test items matches the KTSP (2006) SMA Curriculum.

English National Examination on Reading2011 Package 39

| Material | No of Item | Present | Not Present | Class | Smtr | Note |
|---|------------|---------|-------------|-------|------|------|
| Message | 16-17 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| AnnoEnglish National Examination on Readingcement | 18-19 | √ | – | 2 | 1 | |
| Advertisement | 20-22 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |
| News item | 23-26 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |
| Analytical Exposition | 27-31 | √ | – | 2 | 1 | |
| Report | 32-36 | √ | – | 2 | 1 | |
| Descriptive | 37-40 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |
| Review | 41-45 | √ | – | 3 | 2 | |
| Discussion | 46-50 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |

From the data analysis above the writer concluded that English National Examination on Reading 2011 package 39 has high validity because each of test item match the KTSP (2006) SMA Curriculum.

English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 46

| Material | No of Item | Present | Not Present | Class | Smt | Note |
|---|------------|---------|-------------|-------|-----|------|
| Message | 16-17 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| Anno English National Examination on Reading cement | 18-19 | √ | – | 2 | 1 | |
| Advertisement | 20-22 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |
| Reco English National Examination on Reading t | 23-26 | √ | – | 1 | 1 | |
| Analytical Exposition | 27-31 | √ | – | 2 | 1 | |
| Explanation | 32-36 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| Discussion | 37-41 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| News item | 42-45 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |
| Narrative | 46-50 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |

From the data analysis above the writer concluded that English National Examination on Reading 2011 package 46 has high validity because each of test item match the KTSP (2006) SMA Curriculum.

English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 54

| Material | No of Item | Present | Not Present | Class | Smtr | Note |
|---|------------|---------|-------------|-------|------|------|
| Message | 16-17 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| Anno English National Examination on Reading cement | 18-19 | √ | – | 2 | 1 | |
| Advertisement | 20-22 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |
| Reco English National Examination on Reading t | 23-26 | √ | – | 1 | 1 | |
| Explanation | 27-31 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| Analytical exposition | 32-36 | √ | – | 2 | 1 | |
| Discussion | 37-41 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| Narrative | 42-46 | √ | – | 3 | 1 | |
| News item | 47-50 | √ | – | 1 | 2 | |

From the data analysis above the writer concluded that English National Examination on Reading 2011 package 54 has high validity because each of test item match the KTSP (2006) SMA Curriculum.

Based on the data analysis of English National Examination on Reading English tests 2011 items to the materials suggested by curriculum are:

1. English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 12
 - a. The materials of the first year : 11 items
 - b. The materials of the second year : 7 items
 - c. The materials of the Third year : 17 items
-
- 35 items

| | | |
|--|---|----------|
| 2. English National Examination on Reading2011 Package 25 | | |
| a. The materials of the first year | : | 11 items |
| b. The materials of the second year | : | 7 items |
| c. The materials of the Third year | : | 17 items |
| | | 35 items |
| 3. English National Examination on Reading2011 Package 39 | | |
| a. The materials of the first year | : | 11 items |
| b. The materials of the second year | : | 12 items |
| c. The materials of the Third year | : | 12 items |
| | | 35 items |
| 4. English National Examination on Reading2011 Package 46 | | |
| a. The materials of the first year | : | 11 items |
| b. The materials of the second year | : | 7 items |
| c. The materials of the Third year | : | 17 items |
| | | 35 items |
| 5. English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 54 | | |
| a. The materials of the first year | : | 11 items |
| b. The materials of the second year | : | 7 items |
| c. The materials of the Third year | : | 17 items |
| | | 35 items |

Finding

From the data analysis above the researcher gets the data about percentages of coverage of English National Examination on Reading items. It can be seen on the following table:

The Coverage of English National Examination on Reading2011 Items

| English National Examination on Reading | Grade | The suggested coverage of test items | | The coverage of English National Examination on Reading items | |
|---|----------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|---|------------|
| | | No of items | Percentage | No of items | Percentage |
| English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 12 | 1 st year | 7 | 20 % | 11 | 31.43 % |
| | 2 nd year | 11 | 30 % | 7 | 20 % |
| | 3 rd year | 17 | 50 % | 17 | 48.57 % |
| English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 25 | 1 st year | 7 | 20 % | 11 | 31.43 % |
| | 2 nd year | 11 | 30 % | 7 | 20 % |
| | 3 rd year | 17 | 50 % | 17 | 48.57 % |
| English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 39 | 1 st year | 7 | 20 % | 11 | 31.43 % |
| | 2 nd year | 11 | 30 % | 12 | 34.29 % |
| | 3 rd year | 17 | 50 % | 12 | 34.29 % |
| English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 46 | 1 st year | 7 | 20 % | 11 | 31.43 % |
| | 2 nd year | 11 | 30 % | 7 | 20 % |
| | 3 rd year | 17 | 50 % | 17 | 48.57 % |
| English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 54 | 1 st year | 7 | 20 % | 11 | 31.43 % |
| | 2 nd year | 11 | 30 % | 7 | 20 % |
| | 3 rd year | 17 | 50 % | 17 | 48.57 % |

Data Description

The researcher gets the data description from the data analysis above which can be described as :

The Percentage of English National Examination on Reading2011 Items Package 12

| Grade | No of Items | Percentage |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|
| 1 st year | 11 | 31.43 % |
| 2 nd year | 7 | 20 % |
| 3 rd year | 17 | 48.57 % |

a. 1st year

The items suggested are 7 items; however, there are 11 items for the first year. It means that the test digresses from the first year material.

b. 2nd year

The items suggested are 11 items; but, there are only 7 items for the second year. It means that the test digresses from the second year materials.

c. 3rd year

The items suggested are 17 items; in fact, there are 17 items for the third year. It means that the test compatible with the third year materials suggested.

The Percentage of English National Examination on Reading2011 Items Package 25

| Grade | No of Items | Percentage |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|
| 1 st year | 11 | 31.43 % |
| 2 nd year | 7 | 20 % |
| 3 rd year | 17 | 48.57 % |

a. 1st year

The items suggested are 7 items; however, there are 11 items for the first year. It means that the test digresses from the first year material.

b. 2nd year

The items suggested are 11 items; but, there are only 7 items for the second year. It means that the test digresses from the second year materials.

c. 3rd year

The items suggested are 17 items; in fact, there are 17 items for the third year. It means that the test compatible with the third year materials suggested.

The Percentage of English National Examination on Reading2011 Items Package 39

| Grade | No of Items | Percentage |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|
| 1 st year | 11 | 31.43 % |
| 2 nd year | 12 | 34.29 % |
| 3 rd year | 12 | 34.29 % |

a. 1st year

The items suggested are 7 items; however, there are 11 items for the first year. It means that the test digresses from the first year material.

b. 2nd year

The items suggested are 11 items; however, there are 12 items for the second year. It means that the test digresses from the second year materials.

c. 3rd year

The items suggested are 11 items; however, there are 12 items for the second year. It means that the test digresses from the third year materials.

The Percentage of English National Examination on Reading 2011 Items Package 46

| Grade | No of Items | Percentage |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|
| 1 st year | 11 | 31.43 % |
| 2 nd year | 7 | 20 % |
| 3 rd year | 17 | 48.57 % |

a. 1st year

The items suggested are 7 items; however, there are 11 items for the first year. It means that the test digresses from the first year material.

b. 2nd year

The items suggested are 11 items; but, there are only 7 items for the second year. It means that the test digresses from the second year materials.

c. 3rd year

The items suggested are 17 items; in fact, there are 17 items for the third year. It means that the test compatible with the third year materials suggested.

The Percentage of English National Examination on Reading 2011 Items Package 54

| Grade | No of Items | Percentage |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|
| 1 st year | 11 | 31.43 % |
| 2 nd year | 7 | 20 % |
| 3 rd year | 17 | 48.57 % |

a. 1st year

The items suggested are 7 items; however, there are 11 items for the first year. It means that the test digresses from the first year material.

b. 2nd year

The items suggested are 11 items; but, there are only 7 items for the second year. It means that the test digresses from the second year materials.

c. 3rd year

The items suggested are 17 items; in fact, there are 17 items for the third year. It means that the test compatible with the third year materials suggested.

DATA INTERPRETATION

The interpretation of the data is as follow:

Material Coverage of English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 12

| Material | 1 st year | 2 nd year | 3 rd year | Total |
|------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Reading | 31.43 % | 20 % | 48.57 % | 100 % |
| Vocabulary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Structure | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Writing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 31.43 % | 20% | 48.57 % | 100 % |
| Standard | 20 % | 30 % | 50 % | |
| Digression | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

From the data above it can be seen that the coverage of test items to the material suggested proportional, because there is no item for vocabulary, structure and writing. It proves that English National Examination on Reading 2011 appropriate with the grille of english national examination on reading.

Material Coverage of English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 25

| Material | 1 st year | 2 nd year | 3 rd year | Total |
|------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Reading | 31.43 % | 20 % | 48.57 % | 100 % |
| Vocabulary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Structure | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Writing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 31.43% | 20% | 48.57% | 100 % |
| Standard | 20 % | 30 % | 50 % | |
| Digression | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

From the data above it can be seen that the coverage of test items to the material suggested proportional, because there is no item for vocabulary,structure and writing.It prove that English National Examination on Reading 2011 appropriate with the grille of english national examination on reading.

Material Coverage of English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 39

| Material | 1 st year | 2 nd year | 3 rd year | Total |
|------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Reading | 31.43 % | 34.29 % | 34.29% | 100 % |
| Vocabulary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Structure | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Writing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 31.43 % | 34.29% | 34.29% | 100 % |
| Standard | 20 % | 30 % | 50 % | |
| Digression | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

From the data above it can be seen that the coverage of test items to the material suggested proportional, because there is no item for vocabulary, structure and writing. It proves that English National Examination on Reading 2011 is appropriate with the grille of English national examination on reading.

Material Coverage of English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 46

| Material | 1 st year | 2 nd year | 3 rd year | Total |
|------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Reading | 31.43 % | 20 % | 48.57% | 100 % |
| Vocabulary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Structure | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Writing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 31.43 % | 20% | 48.57 % | 100 % |
| Standard | 20 % | 30 % | 50 % | |
| Digression | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

From the data above it can be seen that the coverage of test items to the material suggested are not proportional, because there is no item for vocabulary, structure and writing. It proves that English National Examination on Reading 2011 is appropriate with the grille of English national examination on reading.

Material Coverage of English National Examination on Reading 2011 Package 54

| Material | 1 st year | 2 nd year | 3 rd year | Total |
|------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Reading | 31.43 % | 20 % | 48.57 % | 100 % |
| Vocabulary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Structure | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Writing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 31.43 % | 20% | 48.57 % | 100 % |
| Standard | 20 % | 30 % | 50 % | |
| Digression | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

From the data above it can be seen that the coverage of test items to the material suggested proportional, because there is no item for vocabulary, structure and writing. It proves that English National Examination on Reading 2011 appropriate with the grille of English national examination on reading.

CONCLUSIONS

From the result of analyzing the five sets of tests of National English Test on Reading for Senior High School, the researcher concludes that:

1. All the items of National English Test on Reading 2011 match the 2006 (KTSP) curriculum and it has high validity.
2. The items of National English Test on Reading 2011 cover all materials suggested by the curriculum.

REFERENCES

Bachman, Lyle, F, 1990, *Fundamental Consideration in Language Testing*, New York: Oxford University Press.

BSNP, 2011, *Ujian Nasional Tahun Pelajaran 2010 / 2011 SMA / MA Bahasa Inggris Paket 12*, Jakarta: Balitbang Kemdiknas.

BSNP, 2011, *Ujian Nasional Tahun Pelajaran 2010 / 2011 SMA / MA Bahasa Inggris Paket 25*, Jakarta: Balitbang Kemdiknas.

BSNP, 2011, *Ujian Nasional Tahun Pelajaran 2010 / 2011 SMA / MA Bahasa Inggris Paket 39*, Jakarta: Balitbang Kemdiknas.

BSNP, 2011, *Ujian Nasional Tahun Pelajaran 2010 / 2011 SMA / MA Bahasa Inggris Paket 46*, Jakarta: Balitbang Kemdiknas.

BSNP, 2011, *Ujian Nasional Tahun Pelajaran 2010 / 2011 SMA / MA Bahasa Inggris Paket 54*, Jakarta: Balitbang Kemdiknas.

Cowie A. P, 1980, *Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Diknas, 2011, *Kurikulum KTSP (2006) Sekolah Menengah Atas (SMA)* Jakarta: Diknas.

Ebel, R. L, 1979, *Essential of Educational Measurement (3rd) P: 4* New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Gronlund, Norman, 1982, *Constructing Achievement Test (3rd)*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Harris, David, P, 1969, *Testing English as a Second Language*, New York: Mac Grawhill Book Company.

Kerlinger, F. N, 1973, *Foundation of Behavioral Research*, New York: Hot Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Oller, Jr. John W. (1979) *Language Test at School*. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Riyana, Jaka dkk, 2008, *English for Senior High School Students Year XII*, Jakarta: BSE.

Riyana, Jaka dkk, 2008, *English for Senior High School Students Year X*, Jakarta: BSE.

Doddy, Ahmad dkk, 2008, *Developing English Competencies for Senior High School (SMA/MA)*.

Robert, Lado, Ph, D, 1961, *Language Testing*, Hong Kong: Peninsula Press Ltd

Tinambuan, Wilmar, 1988, *Evaluation of Students Achievement, P: 3* Jakarta: Depdikbud.